SANCTVS
SANCTVS
SANCTVS

The Oxford Library of Practical Theology

EDITED BY THE

REV. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A.

CANON AND CHANCELLOR OF S. PAUL'S

AND THE

REV. DARWELL STONE, M.A.

PRINCIPAL OF DORCHESTER MISSIONARY COLLEGE

The Oxford Library of Practical Theology

EDITED BY THE

REV. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A.

CANON AND CHANCELLOR OF S. PAUL'S

AND THE

REV. DARWELL STONE, M.A.

PRINCIPAL OF DORCHESTER MISSIONARY COLLEGE

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/sunday0000wbtr

SUNDAY

BY THE REV.

W. B. TREVELYAN, M.A.

Vicar of S. Matthew's,

Westminster

Third Impression

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 Paternoster Row: London

New York, Bombay, and Calcutta

1908

All rights reserved

'Festival solemnity therefore is nothing but the due mixture as it were of these three elements, Praise, and Bounty, and Rest.'—Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. lxx. 2.

'Serve and be chearefull.' — *Bishop Hacket's motto in Lichfield Cathedral.*

TO MY DEAR

FATHER AND MOTHER

WHO HAVE BEEN SPARED IN GOD'S MERCY TO A GREAT AGE

I DEDICATE THESE PAGES

IN DEEP GRATITUDE FOR THEIR

PRAYERS, EXAMPLE

AND COUNSEL

EDITORS' PREFACE

THE object of the Oxford Library of Practical Theology is to supply some carefully considered teaching on matters of Religion to that large body of devout laymen who desire instruction, but are not attracted by the learned treatises which appeal to the theologian. One of the needs of the time would seem to be, to translate the solid theological learning, of which there is no lack, into the vernacular of everyday practical religion; and while steering a course between what is called plain teaching on the one hand and erudition on the other, to supply some sound and readable instruction to those who require it, on the subjects included under the common title 'The Christian Religion,' that they may be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them, with meekness and fear.

The Editors, while not holding themselves precluded from suggesting criticisms, have regarded their proper task as that of editing, and accordingly they have not interfered with the responsibility of each writer for his treatment of his own subject.

W. C. E. N.
D. S.

PREFATORY NOTE

For help and suggestions the writer is indebted to many friends, but especially to his colleague the Rev. G. W. Hockley, who not only contributed the second and third chapters but gave aid throughout; to Canon Overton and Mr. W. J. Birkbeck for their valuable contributions; to his brother, the Rev. G. P. Trevelyan, for untiring assistance in the work of revision; to Mr. G. L. Denman and Mr. T. Ottaway for the note on the Statutes relating to Sunday; to the Rev. W. M. Meredith for letters on the subject of Sunday observance in Scotland; and to those authors and publishers, too numerous to be mentioned individually, who have given permission for quotations to be made.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTORY CHAPTER	1
II.	THE EARLY HISTORY OF SUNDAY	7
III.	THE LATER HISTORY	50
IV.	OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY IN MODERN DAYS	73
V.	PRINCIPLES OF SUNDAY OBSERVANCE	126
VI.	WORSHIP	146
VII.	REST	197
VIII.	SERVICE	229
IX.	CONCLUSION	251

NOTES

On the Statutes relating to Sunday 121
On the observance of Sunday in Russia 181
On the use of Saturday evening 195

APPENDIX

A. The *King's Book* on the Fourth Commandment . . . 264
B. Letter on Sunday Amusements by Bishop Samuel Wilberforce 268
C. Extract from Homily of the Place and Time of Prayer . . 270
D. Extract from Canon xxx. of 1603 271
E. On the temporary disuse in the Early Church of certain terms connected with the Jewish religion, Canon T. T. Carter . 271
F. Autobiography of Sunday, from the *Rambler* 274
G. Mr. Gladstone's observance of Sunday 277
H. Sunday in America 279
I. Sunday in Scotland 284

PAGE

J. Eucharistic Worship: Extract from the *Kiss of Peace*, G. F. Cobb 285

K. On the Comparative disuse of Eucharistic Worship in Post-Reformation times: Extract from Procter and Frere. *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer* 286

L. Eucharistic Worship: Extract from *Marius the Epicurean*, Walter Pater 287

M. The Eve of Sunday, Rev. J. R. Milne 292

N. The Need of Sunday Rest. Review from the *Spectator* . . 294

O. Work of a New York Church, from the *Church Commonwealth* 295

P. Lambeth Conference, 1887. Extract from Encyclical Letter, and Report of Committee 298

INDEX OF SUBJECTS 300

TEXTS QUOTED OR REFERRED TO 306

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

The observance of Sunday is a subject of wide interest, intimately connected with the ordering of our daily lives, and in the present age of rapid transition frequently under discussion.

An Englishman coming home after some fifteen or twenty years spent abroad could not fail to be struck by the changes that have taken place in this matter during his absence. Both in town and country he would miss the old-fashioned quiet. Whether he mingled with rich or poor, educated or uneducated, he would find that the atmosphere of the day has changed, that there is far greater laxity, and a breaking down of old restraints and conventionalities. He would find that the custom of travelling, of entertaining friends, and of being absent from home on Sunday has greatly increased; and moreover that the change is taken for granted without explanation or apology. In short, he would find an altogether new state of things.

Such a man would naturally ask whether the new

or the old way is better, whether people have acted on principle or thoughtlessly, whether they have merely left the old moorings and drifted on without finding new ones, or if behind the change there is a return to truer principles. It is a question worth considering, for it is dangerous to sweep away old ideas without having anything to offer in exchange. As one thinks, for instance, of 'education' in India, of the wave of fresh knowledge that has come to multitudes there, and its results; of the old motives for morality broken down by the influx of new ideas, with nothing put in their place, the old moral restraints abolished without new ones being substituted, one feels that it would indeed be enough to make a man uneasy if anything of the kind were happening amongst ourselves.[1]

It is obvious that, if we are to solve the questions thus raised, or even to get real light on them, we must briefly at least consider the history of Sunday, and the principles which underlie its observance; for it is impossible to understand any institution unless we learn something of its past. In this particular instance the inquiry is far from easy, is, in fact, complicated in a remarkable way. There are many points of difficulty on which we ought to arrive at some understanding, such as the relation of Sunday to the Sabbath, the period

[1] 'It is indeed more than a piece of poetry that would disappear from our lives if we were robbed of this day . . . it has become a necessity of life with us.'—(*Skizzen aus dem Leben der Alten Kirche*; von Theodor Zahn. Leipzig, 1894. Chap. vi. *Geschichte des Sonntags*, p. 198).

during which the observance of the Christian Lord's Day began, the authority on which we observe it. These and many other kindred matters have to be considered, not indeed in such a book as this deeply, but at least intelligently, in order to arrive at a definite conclusion as to what our practice should be.

Further, if we are clear in our own minds as to our principles, it will be easier to decide what we shall or shall not allow to ourselves or others, in the way, for instance, of social intercourse, amusement, reading, work; easier to see how far we ought or ought not to acquiesce in the increased laxity of the day.

Much of a man's real discipline consists in the effort involved in thinking out principles, and applying them to the details of daily life. It seems to be the will of Almighty God that nothing in this world of probation shall be too easy:—'All to the very end is trial in life.' Even where we should naturally have thought that everything would be clear and simple, we often find complications and difficulties.[1] We might have thought that in matters of faith, if a right faith is essential to the conduct of life, everything would have been made so luminously clear that there could be no room left for mistakes. But such is not the case; indeed, a very great part of our probation here depends on the way in which we face and fight through our difficulties in questions of faith.[2]

[1] O'Neill, *Christian Unity*, pp. 178, 179.

[2] Cf. Illingworth, *Personality, Human and Divine*, lect. v.

As in matters of faith, so it is in matters of conscience, such as this question of Sunday raises. It is often by no means easy to say what is right and what is wrong; all kinds of subtle questions have to be thought out before we can come to a decision; even in the commonest things those who 'will to do God's will' are often sorely exercised. But if it be true that the great end of life's discipline is the formation of character, we need not wonder overmuch.

We want clear light such as shall enable us to take a definite line, and no trouble spent in arriving at sound conclusions will be wasted.

In this matter of Sunday observance we stand, so far as we can see, at the parting of the ways. Many of us, who are not quite young, and have been brought up under a *régime* less lax than that of the present day, have, woven into our being, definite ideas as to the manner in which we ought to keep Sunday, ideas which we can never imagine ourselves abandoning. 'It may be different with those who come after us, to whom it will never have been imparted; it is different for many who have been born later than ourselves; but we who were born in it, how can we help it, how can we escape it?' So speaks the old man on his deathbed in W. D. Howells's book, *The Undiscovered Country*, with reference to even deeper matters of faith.

We who possess certain traditional beliefs have the responsibility of thinking and acting rightly for others'

sake as well as our own. We must not stereotype false principles; we must not endeavour to press on others what we are not ourselves clear about, or run the risk of asking from the young that which we have no right to ask; nor must we in asking it base it on false assumptions. If we act wrongly and unwisely now we may provoke a vigorous reaction, the force of which none of us can calculate. England without Sunday will mean sooner or later England without God; there will inevitably come a weakening of faith, a relaxing of moral restraints, which cannot even be contemplated without dread. God grant that this generation may not through any lack of effort fail to do its part in averting such a calamity!

One reason for trying to form 'a right judgment' in this as 'in all things' is that only by having clear ideas ourselves can we avoid being uncharitable to others. The man who sees can afford to be patient. It is the man whose own position is insecure who is for ever trying mentally to justify himself by proving his neighbours to be in the wrong.

The pages that follow are an attempt, however inadequate, to set out as clearly and briefly as may be the history of our subject, and to arrive at sound conclusions as to principles. It will scarcely be denied that there exists a general dissatisfaction with the present state of things, that many consciences are uneasy, and that many earnestly wish for guidance. Too often the matter is dealt with in a merely

negative way; people are told only what they may not do, whereas it is more important to find out what we ought to do—to have positive ideas as to our duty; we shall then have little difficulty in knowing what we ought to avoid.

CHAPTER II

SUNDAY IN THE EARLY AGES OF THE CHURCH

We have seen that it is of the utmost importance, in considering the significance and value of an ancient institution, to look into its origin and examine its history.

It is proposed therefore briefly to trace the early history of Sunday and the principles upon which its observance has been based. Such an examination ought to be of interest, not only to the professed student, but to the ordinary person who is anxious to have an intelligent acquaintance with familiar Christian institutions. The charm of a family heirloom lies not only in its intrinsic value, but in the traditions and associations which connect it with the past. Sunday, one of the treasured possessions of the Christian Church, will be found to have a history of exceptional interest; not only for its own sake, but—so vital has been its connection with the life and experiences of men—as reflecting in a large degree the various changes in the spirit and ecclesiastical attitude of succeeding centuries.

But it is not only for this reason that we are induced

to study the subject. In the case probably of no other institution of such cardinal importance have errors so serious and so continuous been made regarding the grounds of its observance. It is therefore of the first necessity to make sure of the basis on which such observance rests. It is not pleasant to find that what one thinks to be substantial can bear no weight. But exaggerations and misunderstandings have a way of working their revenge, and nowhere has this been more exemplified than in the case of the observance of the Lord's Day. Sunday has a real, an authoritative, and a strong position; and on that account it is best not to attempt to support it by arguments which crumble under historical investigation. To maintain that Sunday is a lineal successor of the Mosaic Sabbath is to say too much; even if it may seem to strengthen its claim at the moment, in the long run it must produce a disastrous reaction. We seem now to be passing through a period of such reaction, and it is therefore important to make evident and unassailable the real grounds on which Sunday rests.

Once more: the ordinary devout Christian obviously ought to be able to give his reasons for observing Sunday. The fashion of the world and his own less spiritual inclinations are on the side of practical neglect; if a man has no plain reasons which can justify its claims, Sunday is in a bad case.

We not infrequently find that in the case of customs or institutions which are most firmly established, we are proportionately vague and uncertain as to the grounds for their observance, and the beginnings from which they have sprung. It may be that their very stability—the very fact that no one thinks of questioning their claim—makes inquiry into their title-deeds appear superfluous and unnecessary. But in an age such as ours, it is impossible to assume that anything will be taken for granted; proof is required, and claims must be justified. Thus apart from the natural interest that an examination of the history of Sunday observance possesses for Christian people, it becomes increasingly necessary that the ordinary man should be able to give an intelligent and rational account of its principles, and this is not an easy matter. We all know the difficulty of meeting a plausible objection with an argument that can hold its ground.

'Why do you keep Sunday?' you are asked. You say perhaps, 'Because I was brought up to it'; and if reminded that you probably have and certainly ought to have a reason for what you do, you may say, 'I do it because the Bible tells me to.' 'But where?' 'In the Fourth Commandment,' is your answer. 'But you do not keep Saturday?' You will then defend yourself by saying that 'Christianity has changed the day.' 'Then you keep your Sabbath on the first day of the week?' Here you probably fall into the trap and

acquiesce in the suggestion. It is then not difficult for your critic to urge that the manifold employments in which your household has been engaged that day have scarcely been in accordance with the strict requirements of the Sabbath rest; and you will be left with the uncomfortable feeling that you are sure you are right in your way of spending Sunday, but that you somehow had the worst of the argument.

Now such a conversation as we have pictured is typical of the confusion that exists in people's minds generally as to the ground on which Sunday observance rests, and the relation of the Fourth Commandment to the conscience of the Christian man. This confusion will be found not only to be very prevalent at the present time, but to have exercised an influence upon Christian thought, if not from the very first, at least for many centuries. It is certainly worth while to clear up our ideas on the matter and get definite principles and solid grounds for our conduct; and to this end a short historical inquiry cannot fail to be useful.

I

It will be well, by way of preliminary, to state the different theories which have been, or still are, more or less widely held by various schools of thought.

1. We must first mention two which need only to be stated to be dismissed. (*a*) All distinctions of times and seasons are abolished under the Christian dispensa-

tion. The Sabbath therefore no longer exists, or if it does exist still, it is a Sabbath of every day. (*b*) The Sabbath is still in force. Christianity came not to destroy, but to fulfil the Law; the obligations of the Fourth Commandment are binding in all their strictness. The Sabbath should be observed by Christians on Saturday, and with all the rigour of the Jewish Law. These two extreme views may be disregarded, and dismissed from practical consideration; they are only worth mentioning as interesting exhibitions of the abnormal working of the Christian conscience.

2. Next are to be noticed two slightly divergent theories of the Sabbatarian school of a kind less extravagant than that last mentioned, both of which are widely accepted and acted on at the present day.

(*a*) The Sabbath is of primeval institution, it was re-enacted by Moses, and has never been abolished or suppressed. The day, however, has been changed. The obligation of the Fourth Commandment to keep the seventh day is practically identical with the obligation to keep one day in seven, and it is now the duty of a Christian to keep the first day of the week with the strictness of the Jewish Sabbath; all that the Bible says of the Sabbath has been transferred to Sunday.

(*b*) Sunday is regarded as the Christian representative of the Sabbath. Instead of the total transference of the Sabbath from one day in the week to another, Sunday has a character of its own, but draws its

obligation simply from the Sabbath, only leaving out what is distinctively Jewish and ceremonial.

3. These ways of regarding Sunday which have just been considered may be described as *Sabbatarian*; the two remaining views which we are to notice may be called *Dominical.*

(*a*) The Sabbath, according to the first view, dates, not from primeval or patriarchal times, but from the time of Moses. It was a positive precept, and as such could be abrogated; it was a special provision made for the Jewish dispensation, and perished when that dispensation came to an end. Sunday, on the other hand, is an entirely distinct institution, and a positive ordinance of the Christian Church. It is not a Sabbath, nor the successor of the Sabbath; it does not depend on the sanction of either the Old or the New Testament; it is not even an Apostolical institution, but a positive ecclesiastical ordinance of the second, or possibly the very end of the first century A.D. It is not intended that Sunday should be wholly employed in religious exercises, nor is it necessary to rest from every kind of occupation, as the Jews were obliged to do, but its purpose is the refreshment of the whole man.

(*b*) The view that still requires to be noticed is akin to the one just mentioned. It regards the Sabbath as abrogated, and does not consider Sunday as dependent on the Fourth Commandment, but traces its sanction, not merely to late ecclesiastical precept, but

to apostolical ordinance. This is the principal point in which this view differs from the previous one, and it is an important point; for if the direct and certain authority of our Lord cannot be claimed for the institution of Sunday, yet it receives a sanction equal to that possessed by such institutions as Confirmation or Infant Baptism, and far higher than any that could be afforded by a late ecclesiastical ordinance.

We shall endeavour to show—from the Holy Scriptures, from the Canons of early Councils, and from the writings of the Fathers—that :—

1. The Lord's Day is a Christian institution, dating from Apostolic times, of very high authority indeed; we only may not say the highest, because we have no express command of God ordaining the observance of the first day of the week.

2. The Lord's Day was not in the earliest times of Christian history considered the successor of, or substitute for, the Mosaic Sabbath, which was regarded as abrogated with the other 'beggarly elements' of the Law; though Sunday of course (and it is important to notice this) preserved a principle identical with that which the Sabbath embodied, viz., the special consecration of a part of our time to God by the sanctification of one day in seven, and has so far succeeded to the sacred position of the Sabbath.

3. The Jewish Sabbath had a 'fulfilment' in Christ, as had the whole Jewish Law; but this fulfilment the Church found, not in the Lord's Day, but in the rest

from sin of the regenerate life, and in the σαββατισμός of heaven.

II

We to whom Sunday is a settled and established institution find it difficult to imagine a condition of things in which Sunday had not any recognised or well-defined claim; we are inclined to presume that it must have at once leaped into an accepted and authoritative position in the Christian Church, either as the result of an ordinance of the Lord, given during the Great Forty Days, or by an express enactment of the Apostolic College to commemorate Easter Day.[1] It must, however, be acknowledged that the facts do not warrant us in stating definitely that the observance of Sunday had its origin in this manner. It may have been the case that it was one of the matters spoken of by the Lord to the Apostles during the Great Forty Days (Acts i. 3). What we are told of our Lord's teaching during those days, important as it is, is but fragmentary, and there must have been much said by Him of which we are not told. If, however, this was not one of the matters spoken of, it is possible that at least it was made the subject of early enactment by the Apostolic company under the promised guidance of the Holy Spirit. Were this the case, the comparative scarcity of reference to Sunday need not surprise us. If it took its place at once as a regular institution of the Church, the very fact that it was familiar and natural

[1] See on this point p. 33.

would (as in the parallel cases of Infant Baptism and Confirmation) account for only occasional reference to it. Its observance would be taken for granted. However, it is impossible to gain certainty on the point; we can do no more than surmise as to how Sunday observance actually arose. It may be more probable that the rise of the regular observance of the first day of the week was gradual, and that it grew up in the atmosphere, so to say, of Christian consciousness and Christian tradition. It is undoubtedly true that from the very first our Lord's Resurrection marked the first day of the week as one which, to a Christian, possessed a special character. Nor, indeed, could we expect anything less than this. The Gospel of Christ is essentially the Gospel of the Risen Christ; this is obvious on the face of the New Testament and of Apostolic teaching; and the supremacy of the fact of the Resurrection necessarily gives its character to the day on which that event took place. All that was most full of vital memories to the first disciples would connect itself with the first day of the week: the various appearances of the Risen Lord on Easter Day, the appearance to the eleven on Low Sunday, and, if anything else were needed, the descent of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost. Here, then, is enough to prepare us to find the first day of the week occupying a special place in the estimation of a Christian, and, in point of fact, we do find that this day was already regarded and observed as a special and a sacred day. In particular,

there are three passages in the New Testament of crucial importance in this connection.

1. Acts xx. 7. This is the account of S. Paul's visit to Troas. We read that S. Paul and his companions arrived there, and 'tarried seven days, and upon the first day of the week, when' the disciples 'were gathered together to break bread, Paul discoursed with them.'

Dr. Hessey's comment on this narrative may be quoted: 'One would think that unless the first day of the week had been already the stated day of Christian assembling, S. Luke's narrative would have run thus: "On the last day of S. Paul's stay he called the disciples together to break bread, and preached unto them." But his language is very different—"the first day of the week," evidently the usual day of meeting for the religious purpose of breaking bread and receiving instruction, if there was any one present to instruct them. The matter-of-course way in which these circumstances are introduced seems to indicate that these were points already established.'[1]

To those brought up in Jewish traditions, what possible significance could there be about the first day of the week, which should entitle it to be used as a date in this manner, unless that significance were due to religious and specifically Christian associations?

2. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2. 'Now, concerning the collection for the saints, as I gave order to the churches

[1] *Bampton Lectures*, lect. ii. p. 40. 1860.

of Galatia, so also do ye. Upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store, as he may prosper,' etc. S. Paul is here urging the Corinthians to take the opportunity of their regular weekly assembly for a collection of alms for the poor, and the force of the inference is increased by its being, so to say, accidental: he does not urge the assembling on the first day of the week, but refers to it as a recognised and established custom, which they are to use as an opportunity for fulfilling the duty of alms-giving which he recommends to them.

3. Rev. i. 10. 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day' (*ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ*). These words will need a little more consideration before they can be certainly regarded as a reference to Sunday. They have been very variously interpreted.

(*a*) Some have supposed S. John to mean the Sabbath Day, but, if so, why should he not say so? The title and the day itself were still in regular and constant use.

(*b*) Or could it have been Easter Day? This is not likely, for the oldest writers apply the term Lord's Day to Sunday and not to Easter Day.

(*c*) Could he mean the Day of Judgment? This has more in its favour than the preceding explanation; certainly the phrase is used in this sense in several passages in the New Testament (*e.g.* 1 Cor. v. 5; 2 S. Pet. iii. 10; Phil. i. 6), and S. John might certainly have seen in spirit the Day of Judgment as

a part of his apocalyptic vision. But it is scarcely probable that he would have actually stated it as the date of the vision which he records, especially when the rest of the references—the place, Patmos, and the causes which brought him thither—are temporal and circumstantial, and in view of the fact that the Apocalypse is, in all probability, not a revelation of the Day of Judgment but rather of our Lord's dealings with His Church throughout the whole Christian dispensation.

(*d*) It only remains to conclude that the Day of the Lord was the first day of the week, which, as we have seen, was already marked for a Christian by the historical event of the Resurrection, and by the religious duties connected with it. This interpretation is confirmed by the fact that the phrase the 'Lord's Day' is that regularly employed by Christian writers afterwards to designate Sunday. This being so, it is certainly an important piece of evidence as to the position which this day was assuming to find that S. John was keeping the Sunday in this Christian manner in his lonely exile at Patmos, and that on that day his great vision was vouchsafed to him.[1]

Let us now endeavour to summarise the evidence which the New Testament has afforded us.

Whatever uncertainty there may be as to the exact manner of its origin, it appears clear that the first

[1] Zahn (p. 213) remarks that 'the order of the week as kept by the Christians of Asia Minor accounts for S. John being so much more particular in his Gospel than the other Evangelists to connect the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord with the days of the week.'

day of the week had, by the end of the first century, attained a definite position as a day of religious observance, for the purposes of Christian assembly; a day on which the Christian specially fulfilled duties to God of worship, duties to his neighbour of charity, and duties to himself of spiritual meditation and devotion. It was taking its place as a positive Christian institution; of this there seems to be no room for doubt. Very likely it only attained this position gradually. In those first days caution and prudence had to be observed with regard to Christian institutions and Christian doctrines. The Church was a small body in the midst of hostile surroundings, and it is not improbable that the Christians who had to worship in secret catacombs would have been obliged at times to intermit the observance of Sunday;[1] but the fact remains that Sunday did take up its position, however gradually, yet securely, and had become an established institution of the Christian Church by the end of the first century.[2]

III

To pass to sub-Apostolic times.

The first document to be quoted after the New Testa-

[1] On the other hand, however (see Zahn, p. 227), 'the congregations gave large sums as bribes to police and military officials to secure their indulgence. . . . The destruction of the churches, the arrest of whole congregations, numerous executions, did not suceeed in doing away with Sunday observance.'

[2] 'Among the *Gentile* Christians the observance of Sunday must have spread very quickly.'—Zahn, p. 214.

ment must be the *Didache: The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*.[1] This document was recently discovered in a manuscript in Constantinople, and given to the world in 1883. It is the work plainly of a Jewish Christian, and should probably be dated at some time during the last quarter of the first century, A.D. Its reference to Sunday is as follows: 'And on the Lord's Day come together to break bread, and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. Let no one that hath a dispute with his fellow come together with you until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice be not defiled. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord, "In every place and time offer Me a pure sacrifice, for I am a great King, saith the Lord, and My Name is wonderful amongst the Gentiles."'[2]

Here at once in a few words is exactly what we found in the New Testament—Sunday, obviously a fixed festival, called by the name which S. John uses for it, and having as the distinctive feature of its observance the celebration of the Eucharist. A *Christian* day emphatically, no Jewish survival or development; nor, though the document was written under strong Jewish influences, is there the faintest indication of any identification of Sunday with the Sabbath Day.

We will next give the well-known testimony of the pagan writer Pliny in his official letter to the Emperor

[1] See Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, appended note L.
[2] C. xiv.

Trajan: 'The Christians affirm the whole of their guilt or error to be, that they were accustomed to assemble together on a fixed day, before it was light, and to sing hymns to Christ as God, and to bind themselves by a *Sacramentum*, not for any wicked purpose, but never to commit fraud, theft, etc.; after which it was their custom to separate, and to assemble again to take a meal, but a general one, and without guilty purpose.'[1] It is of course possible to argue that the fixed day is not Sunday; but taken together with the rest of the evidence the probability is very largely the other way, and if so, the letter is a testimony from a quite distinct and heathen source, that Sunday was observed in the way in which Christian writers assert.

The document ascribed to S. Barnabas, which, whatever its authorship, was in existence in the early part of the second century, contains these words: 'We celebrate the eighth day with joy, on which too Jesus rose from the dead.'[2]

S. Justin Martyr (A.D. 140) writes: 'On the day called Sunday (τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ) is an assembly of all who live either in the cities or in the rural districts, and the memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the Prophets are read.'[3] He then describes the religious acts in which the assembly

[1] Plin., lib. x. ep. 97.
[2] *Ep. S. Barn.*, c. 15; Migne, *Ser. Gr.*, tom. ii. col. 772.
[3] *Apol.*, i. § 67; Migne, *Ser. Gr.*, tom. vi. col. 429 and 432.

joined: Prayer, Celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and Collection of Alms. He then gives the reasons for meeting on that day: 'Because it is the First Day on which God dispelled the darkness and the original state of things, and formed the world, and because Jesus Christ our Saviour rose from the dead upon it.' In another passage he says:[1] 'The command to circumcise infants on the eighth day was a type of the true circumcision by which we were circumcised from error and wickedness through our Lord Jesus Christ, who rose from the dead on the first day of the week; therefore it remains the first and chief of all days.'

S. Irenaeus (A.D. 140-202), in a fragment quoted by Eusebius, mentions the Lord's Day; and, writing in the name of the Churches of Gaul, over which he then presided, concerning the controversy as to the time of keeping Easter, said that 'the mystery of the Lord's Resurrection should be celebrated only on the Lord's Day.'[2] It will be noticed that with regard to the weekly celebration of the Resurrection on the Lord's Day, no diversity is contemplated as possible; whereas the annual celebration was variously observed, and indeed not settled till long after this date.

Tertullian (A.D. 200) says: 'Sunday we give to joy,'[3] and again—'We, *as we have received*, ought on the day of the Lord's Resurrection alone [not on the

[1] *Dial. cum Tryph.*, § 41; Migne, *Ser. Gr.*, tom. vi. col. 564-5.

[2] Euseb. *Historia Ecclesiastica*, lib. v. 23; Migne, *Ser. Gr.*, tom. xx. col. 491; also lib. v. 24; Migne, tom. xx. col. 499.

[3] *Apol.*, c. xvi.; Migne, tom. i. col. 371.

Sabbath] to keep from not only that [kneeling], but every posture of painfulness, and to forbear worldly duties, deferring even our business, that we give no place to the devil.'[1] Here the principle of Sunday *rest*, of which this seems to be the earliest mention, is at once given its proper position as a practical rule, so that, worldly business being put off to another day, full opportunity may be given for the duties peculiar to the Lord's Day.[2]

S. Cyprian (A.D. 200-258)[3] connects the Lord's Day with the Jewish circumcision on the eighth day, which prefigured the newness of life of the Christian, to which Christ's Resurrection introduces him.

The following extract is an interesting one. It is taken from the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, a book of instructions of the Syriac Church, written in the third century, out of which was made a century later a large part of the *Apostolical Constitutions*: 'In thy teaching command and exhort the people to come often to church, and never to fail but always to assemble, and not to narrow down the Church, when they keep themselves away, and so render the body of the Christ short of a member. And let each one apply this to his own case, and not to that of some other person. For it is said: "He that gathereth not with Me, scattereth." Seeing then that ye are members of Christ,

[1] *De Orat.*, c. 23; Migne, tom. i. col. 1191; cf. *de Cor. Mil.*, c. 3; Migne, tom. ii. col. 79.

[2] Cf. Zahn, p. 219.

[3] *Ep.* lix.; Migne, tom. iii. col. 1017.

do not scatter yourselves from the Church, by not coming together; for having Christ your Head present with you according to His promise, and communicating with you, do not be careless about yourselves, nor rob the Saviour of His members; do not rend or scatter His body; nor let the needs of your temporal life take precedence of the Word of God. But on the Lord's Day, laying aside all else, diligently assemble at church. For what excuse shall he give to God who does not come to church on that day to hear the word of salvation, and to be fed with [the holy Food]?'[1]

Before passing from the third century, we may briefly summarise the positive evidence which we have gained from these writers as to the observance of Sunday.

1. The Lord's Day is a thoroughly established Christian institution, part and parcel of the Christian life.

2. It is definitely connected with the Resurrection.

3. The chief duty of this day consists in the assembling of Christians for worship. The celebration of the Sacrament of the Holy Communion is the object of their meeting. To contemplate the observance of Sunday without this Sacrament would have been an impossibility. 'The Lord's Day was that on which the Lord's service was celebrated; in which Christians realised their spiritual union with their Lord and with one another, their "risen life," most closely and

[1] xxx. 14 ff. (Ed. Hauler, Lipsiae, 1900.)

supremely. Indeed it is this that makes any *exhortation* to observe the Lord's Day so rare in these early writers. He who absented himself from Christ's ordinance virtually severed himself from the body of Christ, and relapsed into heathenism.'[1] Together with their common worship and Communion, the reading of the Holy Scriptures, instruction in Christian doctrine and exhortation to holy living, would naturally find a place in the regular weekly assemblies of the Church.

IV

The value of the testimony as to the primitive Christian conception and use of Sunday will, of course, become less as we recede from the earliest times. The references in the New Testament, and the writers in the two centuries succeeding the age of the Apostles, have supplied us with a clear and substantial witness as to the authoritative position which Sunday occupied from the very first in the Church. It now remains to bring forward some quotations from writings of the fourth and fifth centuries and the Councils of that period, and to say a few words on the edict of Constantine.

1. S. Athanasius (A.D. 326), commenting on Psalm cxviii. 24 ('*This is the day which the Lord hath made*'), says: 'What day can this be but the Resurrection day of the Lord, the day which brought

[1] Hessey, *B.L.*, p. 68.

salvation to all nations? which had received its name from Him, namely, the Lord's Day.'[1]

S. Ambrose (A.D. 374): 'The solemnity of the Resurrection is celebrated on the Lord's Day; on the Lord's Day we cannot fast.'[2]

S. Basil (A.D. 370) speaks of the Lord's Day as the day on which Christ rose, and on which we rose with Him; the Church on that day prays standing, as she does throughout Pentecost.[3]

S. Jerome (A.D. 392), in his account of Paula and her companions, has some interesting notices of Sunday: they daily observed six hours, in which they chanted the Psalter, but on the Lord's Day they went to church; on returning from church, they would apply themselves to their allotted task, and make garments for themselves or others.[4]

S. Augustine (A.D. 395): 'We also solemnly keep the Lord's Day and Easter, and certain other Christian festivals.[5]

And: 'The Lord's Day was not made known to the Jews, but to the Christians by the Resurrection of the Lord, and from that time began to be kept as a festival.'[6] 'To fast on the Lord's Day is a grave scandal.'[7]

[1] Migne, *Ser. Gr.*, tom. xxvii. col. 480.
[2] *Ep. classis.* I *Ep.* xxiii. § 11; Migne, tom. xvi. col. 1029.
[3] *De Spir. Sancto*, c. xxvii.; Migne, *Ser. Gr.*, tom. xxxii. col. 191.
[4] *Ep.* cviii.; Migne, tom. xxii. col. 896.
[5] *contra Adimantum*, cap. xvi. § 3; Migne, tom. xlii. col. 156.
[6] *Ep.* lv. 23. [7] *Ep.* xxxvi. 27.

The *Apostolical Constitutions* (*c.* fourth century) speak of the 'Resurrection Day of the Lord, called the Lord's Day, on which Christians are to assemble together to give thanks (εὐχαριστοῦντες) to God.'[1] The reference in this chapter is probably taken from the passage in the *Didache* quoted above.

2. The only General Council which speaks of the observance of Sunday is the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325); the 20th Canon enacts that 'since some kneel on the Lord's Day, and in the days of Pentecost, . . . it is determined by the holy synod that the prayers be made to God standing.'

Bishop Hacket remarks: 'The great council of Nice doth not command the first day of the week to be kept holy, but supposeth all good Christians would admit that without scruple.'[2]

The Council of Elliberis (A.D. 305), Canon 21, threatens suspension from Communion to any person living in a town who shall absent himself for three Lord's Days from church.

The Council of Sardica (A.D. 347) repeats the language of Elliberis.

The Council of Antioch (A.D. 340), in Canon 2, has an important decision on the subject of Sunday, to the effect that any one who comes to church, and hears the Holy Scriptures, but does not join in the

[1] Lib. vii. c. 30.

[2] *Century of Sermons*, Fourth Sermon on the 'Resurrection.'

prayers, or *refuses to receive Communion*, is to be excommunicated, until, upon confession and demonstration of his repentance, he shall receive pardon.

The First Council of Toledo (A.D. 400) enforced the same point (Canon 13).

Other enactments to the same effect are to be found, *e.g.* in *Apostolical Constitutions*:[1] 'Let no one separate himself from the celebration of sacred Masses, nor let any one remain at home when others are going to church'; and in a Canon of the Council of Agde (A.D. 506), 'We enjoin by a special injunction that on the Lord's Day the laity shall be obliged to be present during the whole celebration of the Mass, so that the people do not presume to go out of church before the priest has given the Benediction; if any people do so leave the church, let them be put to open shame by the bishop.'

So, too, our own English Council of Cloveshoe in 747 lays down that 'the Lord's Day be kept with due respect by all; that it be set apart for Divine worship alone, that monks and clerics keep within their monasteries and churches and celebrate Mass; that all worldly business and travelling be avoided, except from urgent cause.'

It will be noticed that as time went on, and the first fire of Christian zeal began to lose some of its intensity, it became necessary to encourage and even enforce the due observance of Sunday.

[1] Quoted by Pellicia, bk. iv. § ii. cap. 1, § 1.

3. We have left to the last the consideration of the Edict of Constantine on the observance of Sunday.[1]

By the Edict of Milan (A.D. 313) the Emperor had already granted toleration to the Christians; and now by this further edict, issued eight years later, in 321, he gives imperial sanction to the observance of the first day of the week.

The edict is as follows:—

'On the venerable day of the sun let the magistrates and people residing in cities rest, and let all workshops be closed. In the country, however, persons engaged in the work of cultivation may freely and lawfully continue their pursuits; because it often happens that another day is not so suitable for grain sowing, or for vine planting; lest by neglecting the proper moment for such operations the bounty of heaven should be lost.'[2]

This edict introduces a new era in the history of the Lord's Day. It is not however easy to determine the exact interpretation or significance which should be assigned to it. Of course, in whatever way it may be interpreted, it must remain as a real record of the

[1] See Euseb., *De Vita Constant.*, i. 12, iv. 18-20.

[2] 'Omnes judices urbanaeque plebes et cunctarum artium officia venerabili die solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positi agrorum culturae libere licenterque inserviant, quoniam frequenter evenit ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis aut vineae scrobibus mandentur, ne occasione momenti pereat commoditas coelesti provisione concessa.' — *Cod. Justin.*, iii. tit. 12, 1., 3.

Church's triumph; for having by the Edict of Milan in 313 A.D. emerged from the condition of a persecuted sect to that of a recognised and authorised religion, she could rightly look upon this second edict as a victory won for God and true religion over the forces of this world.[1]

But, as has been said, there are various ways in which it may be regarded in itself, and very different ways in which it has actually been explained.

(*a*) Thus, some (*e.g.* Eusebius[2] and a writer of a much later date, Cawdrey, one of the Westminster divines) think very highly indeed of the importance of the document, and of the part played by the Emperor in God's Providence. Cawdrey assigns a definitely religious and Christian intention to Constantine, comparing his action with regard to Sunday with that of Moses in reference to the Sabbath.

(*b*) Others, again, take a very different view. It is regarded as a merely civil regulation, with the purpose of bringing order into the Calendar, by definitely fixing one weekly holiday on a day which would be acceptable both to the heathen and Christian subjects of the Empire. It is pointed out in support of the view, that the day is referred to by its heathen title—*dies Solis*; and further, that so far from Constantine desiring to strike a blow at the old religion, in the

[1] Cf. Zahn, p. 197, on Sunday as won for the world by Christianity.
[2] *De Vita Constant.*, ut supra.

very same year he issued an edict having reference to the regular consultation of the auspices.

(*c*) A third and still lower view is that it was an attempt on the part of Constantine to unite all his subjects in the observance of a single form of religion, namely, sun-worship. Before his conversion the Emperor had himself been devoted to Apollo, and Christians were popularly regarded as sun-worshippers; so that the purpose of the edict was to give authority to a form of religion which the whole empire might adopt.

Probably the matter is more simple than some of these speculations might lead us to suppose. Hessey[1] understands its significance as follows :—

It arose from a desire to produce a certain uniformity in this particular matter of festival rest, which should be a real privilege to the Christian, and yet at the same time could not offend the susceptibilities of his pagan subjects.[2] The cessation from business is not enjoined as though work on that day were wrong in itself, but rather in order to afford opportunity and leisure for the observance of the sacred duties belonging to the day. But it was a victory for the cause of Christ, and was so regarded by the Church, and there can be little doubt that Constantine's motive was not merely political; he saw no doubt the political advantage of such an order; but we may well believe that his action was

[1] *B.L.*, lect. iii. pp. 83 ff.

[2] Cf. Zahn, p. 228.

in no small degree dictated by his strong sympathy with Christianity, and that his motives were largely religious. A more definite and decided step seemed to him at the moment ill-advised. We may believe with Eusebius that his object was to 'effect the turning of mankind to God by gentle means.'[1] At any rate, this edict of the Emperor was the beginning of a new era in the history of the Lord's Day.

Here was an authoritative imperial document on which the Church could rely for the observance of Sunday. It gave considerable impetus to the ecclesiastical arrangements of the Calendar. Up to this time the Church festivals had been rare, but now the desire to increase them grew with the opportunity. The next two centuries witness a very great multiplication of the Holy Days of the Church, and it is in connection with this that we can trace the first beginnings of what can rightly be called Sabbatarianism.

In order to impress upon members of the Church the obligation of their new festivals, it was found necessary to obtain for them a clear and unquestionable sanction. It was only natural and indeed right that the institutions of God's ancient people should provide an analogy. The principles on which God deals with His people are permanent, though the expression of those principles varies. The visible embodiment of the truth that our life and our time are consecrated to

[1] *De Vita Constant.*, iv. 18; Migne, *Ser. Gr.*, tom. xx. col. 1166.

God by the observance of stated days and seasons, or the commemoration of great Divine blessings in the same manner, is as proper to the Gospel as to the Law. But analogy is not the same as identification, and when or in so far as this distinction is obscured, there is a real danger lest the true principles of Christian liberty should be replaced by the bondage of the Law.

It is this tendency, very gradual, and yet steadily advancing, which is noticed in the coming centuries.[1] There was indeed a more or less constant witness on the other side, but on the whole the tendency is to look more and more to Judaism for the sanction and authority of the festivals of the Church.

The evidence of the fourth and fifth centuries has confirmed the conclusions gathered from the writings of the earlier centuries—that the Lord's Day is a venerable ecclesiastical institution dating from Apostolic times. Its authority is similar to that possessed by the ordinance of Confirmation, or of Infant Baptism; neither of these has the sanction of any expressly recorded institution of our Lord; each of them has the authority of Apostolic practice, and regular and continuous use in the Church from that time onwards.

V

The remarks made above, by way of comment on Constantine's edict, may fitly introduce the next sub-

[1] No doubt helped by the need of dealing with semi-Christianised nations.

ject which is to be considered. What connection, if any, has the Christian Sunday with the Jewish Sabbath? There can be no doubt that a connection between the two, more or less distinct, has been maintained very strongly in the later centuries of Christianity, and traces of the beginnings of such a theory can be found, though in a very slight degree at first, from the fourth century onwards. Very different schools of thought have at different times appealed straight to the Fourth Commandment as the sanction for Sunday observance. Sometimes it has been due to the exigences of ecclesiastical discipline, which sought in the Jewish code a final and unquestionable justification for the observance of the continually increasing number of festivals, and, so doing, naturally adduced the Fourth Commandment as the authority for Sunday. Sometimes it was Puritan zeal which delighted to impose the restrictions of Mosaic Sabbatarianism on the careless worldliness of the Christian life of its time. But such a reference to the Jewish Law, from whatever direction, has always been a departure from primitive teaching and practice. It may be confidently said that during the first three centuries of the Church, Sunday observance had no connection with Mosaic Sabbatarianism, either in theory or in practice. Certainly, it may be admitted, that, as Dr. Pusey says, 'According to that larger acceptation of the Ten Commandments, whereby they contain the summary of all moral duty . . . the Fourth enjoins

the hallowing of all days, appointed by authority whether Apostolic or of the Church; and of these the Lord's Day, of course, with the great festivals of our Lord, holds the highest place; so that it is still the chief object and intent of the Fourth Commandment.'[1] It may be that the principle[2] of the two days is the same; but the spirit of their observance is very different. 'The old Sabbath,' writes Mr. Gladstone,[3] 'was the festival of rest from labour with the hand; a festival of the body, or the natural life; a festival negative in its character, for its fundamental conception was simply a conception of what man was *not* to do. The Redeemer, like the Creator, had His work, and His rest from His work; this was on the Resurrection Day, and the Apostles and the Church instituted the festival of the new life, as the Creator had (and surely from the beginning) appointed the festival of the old. The festival of the new life—not merely of the act of our Lord's rising, which had for its counterpart the act of the Creator's resting; but of the life, and the employments of the life, which in His Resurrection Body He then ushered into the world. Here comes into view a point, not only of difference, but of contrast. The Fourth Commandment enjoined not a life but a death, and all that may now be thought to require a living

[1] *Rhythms of S. Ephrem Syrus*, trans. by Rev. J. B. Morris. (1847.) Note A. by E. B. Pusey, p. 417. [2] See p. 253.

[3] W. E. Gladstone, *Later Gleanings*; xi. 'The Lord's Day,' pp. 346, 347, 348. (1897.)

observance of the day is not read in, but, as the lawyers say, read into it. But the celebration of the Lord's Day is the unsealing of a fountain head, a removal of the grave clothes from the man found to be alive, the opening of a life spontaneous and continuous. . . . What is essential is that to the new life should belong the flower and vigour of the day. We are born, on each Lord's Day morning, into a new climate, a new atmosphere; and in that new atmosphere, so to speak, by the law of a renovated nature, the lungs and heart of the Christian life should spontaneously and continuously drink in the vital air.'[1]

Now this principle, thus strikingly expressed, is of quite cardinal importance to the proper appreciation of the value and purpose of the Christian Sunday. The Lord's Day takes its place in the Christian life in entire harmony with the spirit which animates the New Covenant of the Kingdom of God. The Sabbath is of a piece with the rest of the provisions of the old legal covenant: 'thou shalt not'; it is a matter of restriction; the binding down within limits, the bandaging of injured members, the strict confinement of the impulses and inclinations of a fallen nature. That process was necessary and most salutary; but in the nature of the thing it would not be permanent. The treatment which a patient has to undergo in a

[1] For Mr. Gladstone's very strict observance of Sunday, see Sir E. W. Hamilton's *Mr. Gladstone: A Monograph*, p. 117; *Mr. Gladstone's Religious Development*, by G. W. E. Russell, p. 18; *Mr. Gladstone's Testimony to the Catholic Faith*, p. 14; and see Appendix G.

hospital ward does not present the true conditions of physical life; it is a preparation for the free, unhindered use of limbs which have suffered hurt, and are intended, by this healing process, to regain their proper activity. So the restrictions of the Law prepare for the liberty of the Gospel. The New Kingdom inculcates a spirit, a character, a life, which shall freely and spontaneously express itself in the large exercise of moral and spiritual activities. Sunday then partakes of this Christian spirit. It represents the energy of a life which puts out its strength in the joyous exercise of conscious power; it is the deliberate consecration, through appointed ways and methods, of a willing devotion to its Master.

But this alone does not express the difference between the Sabbath and the Lord's Day. It must be made clear that in their origin the two days are historically distinct. This distinction may be best seen by considering that:—

1. There is no trace in early Christian writers of basing Sunday observance on the Fourth Commandment, or of regarding the day in a Sabbatarian aspect.

2. The primitive method of dealing with the Sabbath was to *spiritualise* it; to regard it as fulfilled, not in the Lord's Day, but in the rest from sin enjoyed by the Christian, and in the σαββατισμός of heaven (Heb. iv.).

What, we may ask, was the fate of the Sabbath upon the establishment of the Church? Had it dis-

appeared among Christians? In one sense it had. By the coming of the new dispensation of our Lord, the Sabbath had died naturally with the other ceremonies of the Jewish Law. Whether or not the Sabbath was ordained before Moses, and this is a question on which authorities are divided, yet the Sabbath as an existing institution at the time of the Apostles was a distinctively Mosaic ordinance and confessedly based upon the Fourth Commandment of the Decalogue.[1] We should be loath to abandon the belief that the consecration of one day in seven dates from the primeval revelation of God to man, and until the evidence against such an origin for it is stronger than it seems to be at present, there appears no reason to do so. But the special form which that primary institution took through the hand of Moses is a distinctively Jewish one, and to believe that the seventh day was hallowed by the Almighty at the beginning does not prevent us from acknowledging that at the re-creation through His Son the Jewish Sabbath (which partook of the 'parenthetical' nature of the Law)[2] concluded its obligation, and the principle expressed in the primeval ordinance clothed itself in the Christian institution of the Lord's Day.

We say, then, that the Jewish Sabbath ceased upon the inauguration of the Church of Christ. But in practice its disappearance was gradual, and the very

[1] For a discussion of this question, see Hessey, *B. L.*, **lect. iv.**
[2] Gal. iii. 19.

fact that the two institutions, the Sunday and the Sabbath, could continue, if even for a short time, to exist together, makes it difficult, if not impossible, to suppose that the one was considered the successor of the other. The Sabbath lingered for a time from habit and association, but was ever decreasing in honour and estimation.[1] As to any supposed connection between the days, Hessey remarks as follows:—

'In no one place in the New Testament is there the slightest hint that the Lord's Day is a Sabbath, or that it is to be observed Sabbatically, or that its observance depends on the Fourth Commandment, or that the principle of the Sabbath is sufficiently carried out by one day in seven being consecrated to God. Whatever the Lord's Day had was its own, not borrowed from the Sabbath, which was regarded for religious purposes as existing no longer.'[2] At the Council of Jerusalem the question at issue was whether, and in what degree, the Jewish law was binding upon Gentile Converts. That the Council did not make the observance of the Sabbath one of the 'necessary things' may at least be said, even if the argument cannot be pressed to point to the fact that the primary demand upon the Gentiles could not be made to include such observance.[3]

[1] For the observance of the Sabbath side by side with Sunday (and especially in the Eastern Church), see Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. of Christian Antiq.*, vol. ii. art. 'Lord's Day,' p. 1045; and 'Sabbath,' pp. 1823, 1824. Cf. Zahn, p. 204.

[2] *B. L.*, p. 48.

[3] Acts, xv. 20, 28, 29.

In the Epistles of S. Paul we have decisive testimony to the fact that the Sabbath was of obligation no longer.[1] 'Let no man therefore,' he says, 'judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day, or a new moon, or a Sabbath day: which are a shadow of the things to come; but the body is Christ's.'[2] Or again (Gal. iv. 9, 10), 'How turn ye back again to the weak and beggarly rudiments, whereunto ye desire to be in bondage over again? Ye observe days, and months, and seasons and years.'[3] And the writings of the first three centuries make it plain that this was the prevailing, we may almost say, the universal way of regarding this matter, by the Christians of those days. It was only in later times, and then but gradually, though with increasing insistence, that the habit began of translating Jewish festivals into Christian holy days.[4]

[1] Zahn, pp. 207, 222; and cf. 223: 'If under his [S. Paul's] eye the observance of the day of our Lord's Resurrection arose, it is certain that it was neither a continuation nor a replacement of the Sabbath observance; but rather as a witness of the Faith, and the Church's need, independent of any single commandment.'

[2] Col. ii. 16, 17.

[3] Gal. iv. 9, 10. S. Paul (Col. ii. 16; Gal. iv. 9-11; Rom. xiv. 5) implies that it is a matter of indifference whether one day is esteemed above another, or whether every day is esteemed alike. It is perfectly clear that S. Paul held 'that the Jewish Sabbath, like other Jewish ceremonial observances, as the distinction of clean and unclean foods, or Jewish sacred seasons, as new moons, feast days, and sabbatical or jubilee "years" was a matter of indifference to the Christian, and was abrogated under the Christian dispensation.'—Dr. Driver in Hastings's *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. iv. p. 322, s.v. *Sabbath*. See also Appendix E.

[4] 'It never occurred to any Christian of the first three centuries to

Dr. Döllinger takes the same view: 'It is certain then, that in the Apostolic Church the law of the Sabbath was no longer binding in the Jewish sense. Nor is it true to say that the Apostles changed the Sabbath into Sunday, the observance of the seventh day to the observance of the first. For neither is there any trace of such a transference taking place, and, moreover, the Christian Sunday differs widely from the Jewish Sabbath. . . . The first Christians neither kept to the Old Testament day nor the legal manner of observance. They sanctified their new festival as a community for whom the Jewish sharp distinction between work day and Sabbath had no existence, who viewed the whole life of a Christian as a festival, and recognised as their essential and imperishable Sabbath the rest of the soul in God.'[1]

Before leaving the New Testament it may be worth while to make one more remark. It has been said above that the observance of the Sabbath, though in idea and theory, by the nature of the case, it had ceased to be of force, yet was slow in actual practice totally to disappear. And this very fact was seen to confirm the conclusion that the Sabbath and the Lord's Day were distinct. Perhaps it is scarcely worth while to notice what might be a very superficial difficulty at first sight, that in towns apparently of

regard Sunday as a continuation of the Sabbath, and even in the fourth and fifth centuries there are only uncertain beginnings of such a thought.'—Zahn, p. 218.

[1] *The First Age of the Church*, bk. III. ch. ii. pp. 332, 333. (1867.)

Gentile population we read so often of the Apostles preaching to the people on the *Sabbath day*. At Antioch in Pisidia, at Corinth, at Philippi, at Thessalonica, it was the Sabbath which S. Paul chose for his sermons. But the reason is not far to seek. There was a large Jewish population in these countries, and S. Paul's universal custom was to begin by addressing such audience as was found within the synagogue.[1] S. Paul therefore chose the Sabbath Day, because the persons to be appealed to in the first instance were the Jews assembled on the Sabbath Day; and because they then had before them those Scriptures by which the Christian teacher was to prove that their Messiah had come. These assemblies, then, were not those of the Church for Christian worship; but such occasions were made the opportunity by missionary preachers to address those whom they were anxious to convert.

From writers outside the New Testament a few references may be quoted in support of the position maintained above.

One of the most important testimonies is the *Didache*. From its Jewish-Christian origin we might have expected to find traces of connection between the Sunday and the Sabbath, if such a connection had existed, but there is not the least sign of any such connection. Days of fasting are referred to,[2] and

[1] See Prof. W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 141. (1897.)

[2] viii. 1; xiv. 1.

the Lord's Day, but no mention of the Sabbath, and certainly not a thought of connecting it with Sunday. This is significant and important.

S. Ignatius has an interesting passage in which he is contrasting Judaism and Christianity. 'The most holy prophets,' he says, 'though they were concerned in old things, arrived at a newness of hope, no longer observing the Sabbath, but living after the Lord's day.'[1] This is not a reference to Christian practice, but a witness to the anticipation of Christian truth by the saints of the Old Covenant. Only so far is it quoted here as bearing on our subject.

S. Justin Martyr carefully distinguishes between Saturday and Sunday: 'On the day before Saturday they crucified Him, and on the day after Saturday, which is Sunday, He appeared to the Apostles and disciples.'[2]

Tertullian[3] declares that Christians have nothing to do with Sabbaths, or other Jewish festivals, much less with heathen ones, but have their own solemnities, *e.g.* the Lord's Day and Pentecost.

[1] *Ep. ad Magn.*, cc. 8, 9; Migne, *Ser. Gr.*, tom. v. col. 670. Cf. Bishop Lightfoot's note on the passage (*Apost. Fathers*, Pt. II. vol. ii. p. 129) 'κατὰ κυριακὴν] sc. ἡμέραν. 'This "living after the Lord's Day" signifies not merely the observance of it, but the appropriation of all those ideas and associations which are involved in its observance. It symbolises the hopes of the Christian, who rises with Christ's Resurrection, as he dies with Christ's death. It implies the substitution of the spiritual for the formal in religion. It is a type and an earnest of the eternal rest in heaven.'

[2] *Apol.*, i. § 67; Migne, *Ser. Gr.*, tom. vi. col. 429 and 431.

[3] *De Idol.*, c. xiv.; Migne, tom. i. col. 682.

In a note by the Rev. J. B. Morris, in his translation of the *Rhythms of S. Ephrem Syrus*,[1] the translator says: 'The Fathers speak commonly, as in the text, as if the whole principle of observing one day more than another was Jewish and blameable . . . The practice of directly appealing to the Fourth Commandment (now, it is believed, universally appealed to) as a Divine sanction for this principle [of keeping one day holy] belongs, perhaps, to ages with the theology of which the writer is not acquainted; it certainly is not common in antiquity as far as he is acquainted with it; the Fathers rather speak of their *practice* of observing the Lord's Day than of God's *command*.'[1] And he quotes S. Athanasius (*De Sabb. et Circ.* § 4): 'As He commanded them formerly to keep the day of the Sabbath a memorial of the finishing of the former things; thus do we honour the Lord's Day, which is a memorial of the beginning of the second re-creation.'

Dr. Pusey, in his note to this same book of the *Rhythms*, sums up the evidence of the Fathers as follows: 'It is apparent that the Fathers (1) spoke absolutely of the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath; (2) that they did not speak of the Lord's Day as being a transfer of it (Routh, *Rel. Sac.*, tom. iii. p. 475); (3) yet they do speak of it as an Apostolic ordinance; and (4) as a substitution for it, displacing it; (5) that abstinence from business on the Lord's Day, as a

[1] *Rhythms*, i. note E., on § 40, p. 391. (1847.)

religious duty, was a universal tradition; and (6) enforced by the Church.'[1]

VI

We are thus brought to the question of Sunday rest. There are not many early references to it; but those which are found clearly show the principle on which rest from labour on Sunday was regarded. It is not Sabbatarian; that is to say, the rest is not considered as an end in itself,[2] or as fulfilling the requirements of Sunday observance.[3] It has reached an altogether higher level; it is a means to a more noble end; it is in order to give leisure and opportunity for the fulfilment of those solemn obligations of worship and devotion which properly belong to the Lord's Day. We will give two references from the Fathers and two from Councils.

Tertullian says: 'On the Lord's Day we ought to

[1] See p. 32. [2] *Rhythms*, note A. p. 417.

[3] 'In the history of the Jewish Sabbath,' says Dr. Dale, 'the rest came first and the worship followed; in the history of the Christian Sunday, the worship came first, and the rest followed. To the idea of the Jewish Sabbath, rest was essential, worship was an accident; to the idea of the Christian Sunday, worship is essential, and rest is an accident.'—*Ten Commandments*, p. 108. So too Dr. Driver says, 'It should be borne in mind that the idea expressed by שַׁבַּת and שָׁבַת is not the positive "rest" of relaxation or refreshment (which is נוּחַ) but the negative rest of cessation from work or activity,' and he quotes Exod. xxiii. 12, 'Six days shalt thou do thy work and on the seventh day thou shalt desist.'—Hastings's *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. iv. s.v. *Sabbath*.

avoid all anxious employment, even putting off our business, lest we give place to the devil.'[1]

S. Chrysostom declares that 'the Lord's Day hath rest and immunity from toils.'[2]

The Council of Laodicea (A.D. 363)[3] lays down that Christians are not to Judaise, and rest on the Sabbath, but to work on that day; while, because of the peculiar honour due to the Lord's Day, they are then, if they are able, to rest as Christians (σχολάζειν ὡς χριστιανοί).

The third Council of Orleans (A.D. 538)[4] deprecates Judaistic over-strictness, 'inasmuch as the people are persuaded that on the Lord's Day journeys ought not to be made with horses, or oxen and carriages, nor ought they to prepare anything for food, nor in any degree to do anything appertaining to the cleanliness of either house or person (which thing is approved to belong to Jewish rather than to Christian observance), we decree that on the Lord's Day what was afore lawful to be done is lawful.' The Council then proceeds to forbid all works of agriculture, 'in order that, coming together to Church, they may the more easily give themselves to the grace of prayer.'

This last quotation indicates that there was a popular feeling in the direction of Sabbatarianism by the time of the sixth century; and there is abundant evidence to show that later this tendency grew

[1] *De Orat.*, c. 23; Migne, tom. i. col. 1191.
[2] *Hom.* 43, § 2; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; Migne, *Ser. Gr.*, tom. lxi. col. 368.
[3] Canon 29.
[4] Quoted by Pusey, *ut supra.*

in strength, and was systematically encouraged and enjoined by authority, so that before long the restrictions as to Sunday employment rivalled those of the most elaborate rules of Judaism.[1] It is equally clear that this development was a departure from primitive belief and practice, and that the idea of Sunday rest as the opportunity for religious worship was in danger of being lost in the subtleties of a Christian Sabbatarianism.

The Sabbath, however, had been an ordinance of God; either of primeval antiquity, or, as all allow, of Mosaic institution. It partook, therefore, of the nature of that Law which is 'holy and righteous and good,'[2] and it came under the terms of our Lord's declaration, in which He asserted that His mission was 'not to destroy, but to fulfil.'[3] Undoubtedly; but the point is that the 'rest' of the Sabbath was regarded by the early Church as fulfilled, not in the institution of the Lord's Day, but in that spiritual rest and refreshment in the freedom from sin and the enjoyment of God, and the eternal rest of heaven, which is the privilege of those who are united with the life of the Lord Jesus Christ.[4]

[1] For ecclesiastical rules, see Hessey, *B.L.*, lect. iii. pp. 116 ff; and for the refinements of Judaism, see Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii. App. xvii.

[2] Rom. vii. 12. [3] S. Matt. v. 17.

[4] 'The early Christians thought to observe the Sabbath, not by daily, weekly, or monthly recurring solemnities, but by refraining from sin, and continually doing good works with a quiet conscience,

Indeed, Jewish teachers had prepared the way for this, dwelling much upon the symbolical meaning of the Sabbath as prefiguring the 'world to come,'[1] and Christian writers freely followed on the same line. For instance S. Justin Martyr[2] asserts that the New Law requires us to keep a perpetual Sabbath, and that to turn from sin is to keep the delightsome and true Sabbaths of God.[3] S. Irenaeus[4] also declares that the Sabbath, like the whole Jewish law, was symbolical, that it was intended to teach men to serve God every day, and that it was likewise typical of the future kingdom of God, in which he who has persevered in godliness shall rest and partake of the Table of God.

Tertullian,[5] again, insists that the Sabbath was figurative of rest from sin, and typical of man's final rest in God.[6]

hoping for the eternal Sabbath awaiting God's people. Their Sunday observance had no relation to this commandment.'—(Zahn, p. 225.)

[1] See Westcott on Heb. iv. 9.

[2] *Dial. cum Tryph.*, § 12; Migne, *Ser. Gr.*, tom. vi. col. 500.

[3] See Appendix A, p. 247.

[4] *Contra Haer.*, iv. 16; Migne, *Ser. Gr.*, tom. vii. col. 1015-6.

[5] *Adv. Judaeos*, cap. iv.; Migne, tom. ii. col. 605-6.

[6] See also other writers quoted by Pusey in his note in Mr. Morris's edition of *S. Ephrem Syrus*, referred to above; by W. E. Gladstone, from S. Augustine, in *Later Gleanings*; and see Westcott on Epistle to the Hebrews, iii. 11, iv. 9; see also Lightfoot on Epistle to Colossians, ii. 16, and his quotation from Origen *c. Cels.*, viii. 21-22. And on the general question of the observance of Christian festivals, see Hooker, *E.P.*, v. lxix-lxxi; esp. c. lxx. § 4: 'Let us not take rest for idleness . . . They rest which either cease from their work when they have brought it unto perfection, or else give over a meaner labour because a worthier and a better is to be undertaken.'

It is the conception made familiar to us in the well-known hymn of Abelard, the twelfth century schoolman:

> 'O quanta qualia sunt illa sabbata
> Quae semper celebrat superna curia!
> Quae fessis requies! quae merces fortibus!
> Cum erit omnia Deus in omnibus.
> . . . . . .
> Illic ex sabbato succedit sabbatum;
> Perpes laetitia sabbatizantium.'

We have endeavoured in this chapter to indicate the principles upon which Sunday observance was based by the Christian Church of the first few centuries; we have tried to arrive at the primitive and original conception of the Lord's Day; but that is all. The needs of other times may require the re-application of old principles. The Church may have to make her appeal to modern England in a different form from that in which she appealed to the age of the early martyrs and confessors, and in countries where social conditions were of a vastly different nature;[1] but a discussion of such questions does not belong to an historical investigation, and will therefore be left for consideration in succeeding chapters.

[1] For the claims of Sunday upon the modern world, see H. S Holland in *Commonwealth*, June, 1899.

CHAPTER III

LATER HISTORY

THE development in the Middle Ages of Christian ideas with regard to Sunday has been indicated in the latter part of the preceding chapter, and it will not be necessary to follow it out in any detail.

I

The tendency which had begun to show itself in the fourth and fifth centuries grew apace as time went on. With the gradual multiplication of festivals there arose the need of determining which festivals were of obligation, and, further, of providing a clear and unquestionable sanction for observing such days. The provisions of the Old Covenant had already, and not improperly,[1] been seen to provide an *analogy* for the observance of the Christian solemnities; but now a distinct advance on this is made, and analogy becomes *identification*. It was a considerable gulf to cross, but, the leap once made, the natural result was reached. The enforcement of Sunday observance proceeded on

[1] See end of preceding chapter.

frankly Sabbatarian grounds; and the regulations as to what might or might not be done on that day became Judaic in their strictness. Thus, *e.g.*, the second Council of Mâcon (A.D. 585) enjoined 'that no one should allow himself on the Lord's day, under plea of necessity, to put a yoke on the necks of his cattle; but all be occupied with mind and body in the hymns and the praise of God. *For this is the day of perpetual rest; this is shadowed out to us by the seventh day in the law and the prophets.*'[1]

In Constantine's edict, special exemption from Sunday rest had been granted to agricultural work, and this had been embodied in the Code of Justinian; but in A.D. 910 the Emperor Leo Philosophus repealed this exemption.

In England the restrictions were at least as severe as in other parts of Christendom; the Constitutions of Egbert (A.D. 749) forbade all work on the Lord's Day; and in a law of Edgar the Peaceable (A.D. 958) it is ordered that the Lord's Day shall commence at three o'clock in the afternoon of Saturday, and last until the dawn of Monday.[2]

S. Bernard and S. Thomas Aquinas both consider Sunday as the Christian Sabbath, while Archbishop

[1] Cf. Zahn, p. 232.

[2] It may well be considered, however, whether it would not be a real benefit to endeavour to carry into practice the principle here expressed; that is to say, to observe the latter part of Saturday as a time of quiet preparation for the coming festival. See J. R. Milne, *Primitive Christianity and Sunday Observance.*

Chichele goes so far as to speak of 'dies Dominicus videlicet dies septimus.'

This tendency, however, did not proceed without protest from men of equal weight and of acknowledged authority. S. Gregory the Great wrote in the strongest language against Sabbatarianism; he calls it the work of Antichrist, and maintains that the Sabbath is to be interpreted spiritually; while he still claims for the Lord's Day rest from earthly labour, and strict attendance upon prayer; and Theodolphus, Bishop of Orleans, gives a thoroughly primitive origin for Sunday: 'On it God created the light, on it He rained down manna in the wilderness; on it the Redeemer of the human race rose again from the dead; on it He poured out the Holy Spirit on His disciples.' And a Synod at York, as late as 1466, in explaining the Decalogue, lays down that the obligation to keep holy day on the legal Sabbath wholly expired with the other ceremonies of the law; while the manner of keeping holy days is to be taken, not from Jewish superstition, but from the directions of the Canons.

At the same time, as a natural reaction against the unreasonable restrictions which were laid upon Christian consciences, there were many who were driven to reject everything in the shape of fast or festival. Thus the sect of the Petrobussians in the twelfth century, the Waldenses in the thirteenth, and the Lollards in the fourteenth, disparaged all distinction of days, refusing to acknowledge the authority of

Sunday itself. And in general a practical disregard of religion and of the Lord's Day coincided with the growing complications of ecclesiastical Sabbatarianism.

'The Reformation,' says Hessey, 'found the Lord's Day obscured by a sort of Sabbatarianism established on an ecclesiastical foundation.'[1] Such an insecure position had already exposed it to practical neglect and very general desecration; it was made an opportunity for licentious amusement. Another result was this, that the zeal of the Reformers found it fatally easy, in their desire to be rid of the errors with which human ingenuity had wrapped it round, to let slip the true Divine institution which had been so sadly obscured. Among the continental reformers there were considerable differences in the way in which the authority of Sunday observance was regarded.[2] Some went further in rejecting the claims of the first day of the week than others were disposed to do. But on the whole Hessey sums up their attitude as follows: 'They are utterly opposed to the literal application of the Fourth Commandment to the circumstances of Christians. They scarcely touch upon that commandment, except to show that the Sabbath has passed away. So far they agree with the Ancient Church. But when we examine the manner in which they speak of the Lord's Day, we cannot help noticing a marked

[1] *B. L.*, lect. iii. *ad fin.*

[2] For the attitude of the Continental reformers (especially Luther and Calvin) in this matter, see Zahn, pp. 233, 236-238.

difference between them and the early Fathers. That simple assertion, "We observe the first day, on which Christ rose from the dead," is never made by them as a matter of course, without the slightest fear of its being called in question, and with no more doubt of its admissibility than attends anything else derived from the inspired Apostles. They feel it necessary to defend their practice, on grounds sometimes perhaps of Apostolic example (with the proviso, however, that such example is to be taken only for what it is worth), but generally of antiquity, of the Church's will, of the Church's wisdom, of considerations of expediency, of regard to the weaker brethren, and sometimes on lower grounds still. And neither the day itself, nor the interval at which it occurs, is of obligation. Our Lord's Resurrection is made a decent excuse for the day, rather than the original reason, or one of the original reasons of its institution. We miss also in their writings that close connection of the Lord's Day with the Lord's Supper, which was prominently brought forward in early times.[1]

II

It is more to our purpose to consider what line was taken at the Reformation, and, in later times, by the Church in our own country.

The teaching in this matter at the commencement

[1] *B. L.*, lect. vi. pp. 230, 231.

of the Reformation may be gathered from *The Institution of a Christian Man* (the Bishops' Book), put forth in 1535, and *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of any Christian Man* (the King's Book), put forth in 1543.[1] It is taught here that the Sabbath is abolished in its literal sense, and that S. Augustine makes a difference between the Fourth Commandment and the remaining nine; but the statement is made that 'instead of the Sabbath Day succeedeth the Sunday, and many other holy and feastful days'; and the observance of Sunday, as well as of other festivals, is grounded upon the ordinance of the Church, without mention of the higher authority of Apostolic practice.

When we come to look at the present formularies of the English Church, we are struck by the fact that very little indeed is directly said as to the observance of Sunday; its observance is evidently assumed, as well as that of other holy days; as, *e.g.*, by the appointment of special Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for Sundays and festivals, and it is therefore taken for granted that at least on these days and within the octaves of the greater festivals the Holy Eucharist will be celebrated.

The Catechism in explaining the Fourth Commandment simply interprets it as enforcing the duty 'to serve God truly all the days of my life.' The Ten Commandments were inserted in the Holy Communion Service in 1552; it is reasonable to suppose that the

[1] See Appendix A.

Fourth Commandment is there to be understood in the same way as it is interpreted in the Catechism; that is to say, not as binding us to the ceremonial observance of the Jewish Sabbath, but as inculcating the moral principle of the consecration of our time to God, and the need of realising this by the regular setting apart for special purposes of a portion of that time. That the compilers of the Prayer Book regarded the institution of Sunday as resting on higher ground than other festivals of the Church may be gathered from a circumstance which occurred at the Savoy Conference. The Presbyterians demanded that if any saints' days be retained, they might be called festivals, not holy days, nor be made equal with the Lord's Day. The reply was that the observance of saints' days is not as of Divine, but ecclesiastical institution.[1]

It appears likely that the strong Sabbatarian spirit which laid hold of England in the time of the Puritan ascendency was in part at least the outcome of the desire of the Puritans to belittle other festivals. No such exaggerated spirit has marked the observance of Sunday amongst foreign Protestants, either at the time of the Reformation or in our own day. The following words, written in 1845, by Mr. Samuel Laing, a Scottish Presbyterian, show what the state of affairs was in Geneva itself at that time.

'In the villages along the Protestant side of the

[1] See also Hooker, v. lxxi, 3, and notes in Keble's edition.

Lake of Geneva—spots especially intended, the traveller would say, to elevate the mind of man to his Creator by the glories of the surrounding scenery—the rattling of the billiard balls, the rumbling of the skittle-trough, the shout, the laugh, the distant shots of the rifle-clubs, are heard above the psalm, the sermon, and the barren forms of state-prescribed prayer during the one brief service on Sundays, delivered to very scanty congregations—in fact, to a few females and a dozen or so old men in very populous parishes, supplied with able and zealous ministers.'[1]

The Homily *On the Time and Place of Prayer*[2] may seem to be in danger of tending in a Sabbatarian direction; and indeed it is possible that it did do so; the authority, however, of the Homilies is not such as to make them, in all their details, a secure or binding expression of the attitude of the English Church. Archbishop Bramhall interprets it as setting forth that the Fourth Commandment[3] 'obligeth Christians no further than that part of it which pertaineth to the Law of Nature.'

We may legitimately conclude that the Church of England commits us to no Sabbatarian view of the Lord's Day; and we may be justified in believing

[1] Quoted in Baring Gould's *Germany, Present and Past*, vol. ii. p. 164; see also Appendix B.

[2] See Appendix C.

[3] Discourse on the Sabbath, *Works*, vol. i. p. 70.

that, in this matter, as in others, she would send us back to antiquity, and to the teaching of the Primitive Church.[1]

In practice, the observance of Sunday in England since the Reformation cannot be considered satisfactory. During that period of religious upheaval men's minds had become unsettled even on the most fundamental matters; and in their need of guidance they were but little assisted by the traditions of mediæval custom. Some hold to that ecclesiastical Sabbatarianism[2] which was defective in theory and practice; others were led by a reaction against these defects into a studied and conscientious disregard of the obligation of Sunday.

Men whose hearts were filled with the sense of religion and the love of God kept Sunday carefully and earnestly, up to their lights; while those whose devotion needed the spur of outward regulation took advantage of the general disorder to indulge their natural laxity; while throughout the troubled centuries the swing of the pendulum moved slowly but regularly backwards and forwards. We sometimes speak in a vague way of the 'good old days' in contrast to our own time; but it is probable that such 'good old days' are rather the product of an imagination

[1] See Appendix D.

[2] An extreme Sabbatarian theory and practice had gradually grown up under the sanction and authority of the Church.

discontented with its own time than an actual fact.

In the reign of Elizabeth, there can be little doubt that Sunday observance was at a very low ebb. The Homily '*Of the Place and Time of Prayer*' draws a vivid picture of the state of things in the latter half of the sixteenth century. 'It is lamentable to see the wicked boldness of those that will be counted God's people, who pass nothing at all of keeping and hallowing the Sunday. And these people are of two sorts. The one sort if they have any business to do, though there be no extreme need, they must not spare for the Sunday, they must ride and journey on the Sunday—they must buy and sell on the Sunday, they must keep markets and fairs on the Sunday; they use all days alike; workdays and holy days are all one. The other sort is worse. For although they will not travel nor labour on the Sunday, as they do on the week day, yet they will not rest in holiness, as God commandeth; but they rest in ungodliness and filthiness; they rest in excess and superfluity, in gluttony and drunkenness, like rats and swine; they rest in brawling and railing, in quarrelling and fighting; they rest in wantonness and toyish talking, in filthy fleshliness; so that it doth too evidently appear that God is most dishonoured, and the devil better served on the Sunday, than upon all the days of the week besides.'

'Practical religion,'[1] says Daniel Neal, writing of

[1] *Hist. of the Puritans*, vol. i. p. 342.

A.D. 1582, 'was at a very low ebb; the fashionable vices of the time were profane swearing, drunkenness, revelling, gaming, and profanation of the Lord's Day.'

Such a state of things did not pass without protest; the more godly-minded of the nation could not but be distressed at this scandal to religion and morality. The chief protest proceeded from the newly formed sect of the Puritans. They took a strong and consistent line, though one that could not be defended on theological or historical principles. They went to the Bible, and simply and boldly transplanted all the severe and definite obligations of the Jewish Sabbath to the Christian Sunday; they even discarded the use of the name Sunday, which had in their ears a heathenish sound, and called the Lord's Day the Sabbath. This teaching had a certain compelling attractiveness; and the zeal and earnestness of its advocates were infectious. In 1595 a certain Dr. Bownd reduced the Puritan Sabbatarianism to a system. His intention was excellent, and the immediate results were, as far as they went, good. 'It is almost incredible,' says Fuller, 'how taking this doctrine was, partly because of its purity, and partly for the eminent piety of such persons as maintained it; so that the Lord's Day, especially in corporations, began to be precisely kept.'[1] But it was impossible that such a system could claim the allegiance of Catholic Christians, or that it should maintain a

[1] *Ch. Hist.*, vol. v. p. 214.

permanent position, so far was it from attempting to express the full requirements of the Lord's Day, or from being anything else than a Jewish day of rest. We are not therefore surprised to find that it provoked criticism and opposition.

Archbishop Whitgift, in 1599, took strong action. He condemned this teaching in his synods and visitations, called in whatever copies of Dr. Bownd's work he could lay his hands on, and forbade it to be reprinted; and there was a general movement amongst persons in authority to discourage and prohibit the tendency which it had originated. But without much success; for in the reign of James I. its teaching still held a strange power over men's minds. 'In a very little time,' says Heylin, 'it grew the most bewitching error, the most popular deceit, that had ever been set on foot in the Church of England.'[1]

But the king endeavoured to offer some resistance by issuing, in 1618, the famous *Book of Sports*. This document was intended as a relief to those who had been accustomed to more liberty on Sunday, and found the Puritan strictness to result in a day of purposeless inactivity; they had not been trained to the true religious use of the day, and they found time hang heavily on their hands; with the inevitable danger of falling into that 'mischief' which 'Satan finds for idle hands to do.' The *Book of Sports* allowed persons after church time to indulge in

[1] *Hist. of the Sabbath*, pt. ii. c. 8.

athletic games, and pursue such pastimes as were not in themselves unlawful. This document was to be read by the clergy during the church service. But this was not very generally enforced; Archbishop Abbot was not in sympathy with the measure himself;[1] he refused to allow it to be read at Croydon; and, in fact, it was at length silently dropped. It was, however, under the influence of Laud, revived in the reign of Charles I.; and the melancholy reactions, which seem to be the characteristic and inevitable feature of the history of Sunday, are illustrated again by the licentiousness of the reign of Charles II., followed by the rise of Methodism in the eighteenth century.

If there is one lesson more than another which our investigations up to this point would seem to enforce, it is the importance, already mentioned, of arriving at sound and solid principles in this vexed matter; of recognising the need of comprehensiveness of view, and 'sanctified common sense'; and of cultivating that spirit of charity in judgment[2] which S. Paul insisted on in similar matters, and would have us discern to be an essential feature of the Body which claims the name of Catholic.[3]

III.

The line here adopted seems the only one possible to take, in view of the historical facts. Yet it may

[1] Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, vol. ii. p. 114.
[2] 1 Cor. viii. *passim*, x. 23. [3] Eph. iv. 1-3.

be that in the providence of God the Sabbatarian idea of the Lord's Day has been kept alive for a good purpose, and that in practice we may be obliged to some extent to act upon it.

1. To the fervour and zeal of the early Christians the weekly observance of the day of our Lord's Resurrection was a natural, we might almost say a necessary, outcome of their faith. Christians needed no external rules to make them observe that day as one of glad and joyous worship. But as love waxed cold and faith grew less keen, liberty would degenerate into licence, and once more there would be need of outward rules and regulations.[1]

2. Moreover, as time went on, it became possible for the idea of the Sabbath to emerge again. It had been of necessity withdrawn for a time. S. Paul had been obliged to emphasise unmistakably the fact that the Sabbath was a dead thing.[2] It would have been for a long time perilous to allow any Sabbatical association to cling to the Lord's Day; indeed the two were so obviously distinct that it would have been impossible. But as years went on, the peril of a Judaistic spirit would vanish, and the underlying association of the Sabbath, as teaching the need of the definite consecration to God of a part of man's time, could be safely emphasised.

3. There are many parallels to this necessary disappearance of a word or a practice for a time.

[1] Cf. Zahn, p. 226. [2] Col. ii. 16. See p. 40, *supra*.

We, for instance, can and do use words of a sacrificial import, such as 'priest' or 'altar,' without the smallest danger of a Jewish connotation, but it was not for some time that this was possible.

'There is a change of terminology, which means a change of circumstances rather than of ideas. . . . "It would only have caused confusion," Mr. Simcox[1] justly says, "when a great company of priests was obedient to the faith, to have said that S. Barnabas was a priest, when he was in fact a Levite." The term "priest" indeed carried with it many associations, Jewish and pagan, which did not belong to Christianity. Outside the Epistle to the Hebrews Christ is not termed a priest, and even there it is said: "If He were on earth He would not be a priest, seeing there are those who offer the gifts according to the law."[2] So, too, it is conceivable that a Christian missionary of our own day might find it necessary, amidst the associations of a pagan priesthood, to emphasise by the avoidance of the term the points of difference in the Christian ministry, just as it would have been wiser at times to have produced a monotheistic atmosphere as a preparation for preaching the divinity of Christ.

'But when once the Christian atmosphere has been cleared, when once the unique High Priesthood of Christ is realised and the communication of that priesthood to the Church, it becomes natural to

[1] *History of the Early Church*, p. 59.
[2] Heb. viii. 4.

apply the term 'priest' to the divinely ordained ministers of this priestly congregation.'[1]

Similarly, the peril of a false interpretation, when taken in connection with the needlessness of rigid or formal limitations, made the use of any Sabbatarian terms in connection with the Lord's Day a moral impossibility for many years.

4. Ideally, it should have remained, if not impossible, at least unnecessary, to introduce Sabbatarian ideas. But human nature being what it is, disordered and imperfect, we can well understand that as time went on it was found wise to borrow from the Jewish Sabbath something of its restrictions and sanctions. Here we may find a parallel in connection with the practice of fasting. If human nature were what it ought to be, fasting would be unnecessary; but being what it actually is, fasting is needful for the subduing of the flesh to the spirit.

We may find a further and perhaps closer analogy in the practice of almsgiving. Under the Jewish law, a tenth part of property was set apart for God, just as a seventh part of time was consecrated to His service. The methods of dealing with time and money were strictly parallel.

At the beginning of the Christian dispensation, a Christian needed no rules to enforce and regulate a devotion which was the natural and necessary outcome

[1] Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, c. iii. p. 199. See also Carter, *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, quoted in Appendix E.

of his love; but as ardour cooled, and love grew sluggish, rules and restrictions were bound to reappear. So, too, at first, did the Christian feel with regard to his property; the *whole* of it belonged to God; 'all that believed were together, and had all things common' . . . 'and not one of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own.'[1] Here was a splendid ideal, but its actual practice was of short duration; and as the motives of selfishness and self-interest began to re-assert themselves, the need of the Jewish law of tithe became apparent.

At the same time, of course, no earnest-minded Christian would feel that the obligation of the tithe relieves him of all further responsibility with regard to wealth, neither would he be content to keep Sunday merely in accordance with the requirements of the Jewish Sabbath.

5. So long, then, as we do not forget the true nature of the Christian Sunday, and so long as we point men to the ideal, we may be content in a measure to incur the charge of Sabbatarianism. What we should all like to see would be a Christian consciousness so active and vigorous that we can depend upon it to claim and consecrate to holy uses such time as its spiritual energies demand. What, in point of fact, we do see is something very far short of this. The difficulties and obstacles in the way of spiritual development being so great, a constant and regular safeguard is needed. If

[1] Acts, ii. 44, iv. 32.

the accusation of Sabbatarianism is brought against such a view as this, it must be admitted that the charge is in some degree a true one. At the same time it must be remembered that, the difference of the institution of the Sabbath, and the purpose and nature of the 'rest' being so great, the word Sabbatarianism is something of a misnomer.

. . . . . .

The following passages from modern writers of various schools of thought will be found to support the position taken above—a position which practically is that of many of the ancient writers already quoted, who clearly show their consciousness of the need of safeguarding a day which, in the first enthusiasm of Christian faith, needed no safeguard.

'Peculiar difficulties attend the discussion of the subject of the Sabbath. If we take the strict and ultra ground of Sabbath observance, basing it on the rigorous requirements of the Fourth Commandment, we take ground which is not true; and all untruth, whether it be an over-statement or a half-truth, recoils upon itself. If we impose on men a burden which cannot be borne, and demand a strictness which, possible in theory, is impossible in practice, men recoil; we have asked too much, and they give us nothing—the result is an open, wanton, and sarcastic desecration of the Day of Rest.

'If, on the other hand, we state the truth, that the Sabbath is obsolete—a shadow which has passed—without modification or explanations, evidently there is a danger no less perilous. It is true to spiritual, false to unspiritual men; and a wide door is opened for abuse. And to recklessly loosen the hold of a nation on the sanctity of the Lord's Day would be most mischievous, to do so wilfully would be an act almost diabolical. For if we must choose between Puritan over-precision on the one hand, and on the other that laxity which, in many parts of the Continent, has marked the day from other days only by more riotous worldliness, and a more entire abandonment of the whole community to amusement, no Christian would hesitate;

no English Christian at least, to whom that day is hallowed by all that is endearing in early associations, and who feels how much it is the very bulwark of his country's moral purity.

'Here, however, as in other cases, it is the half truth which is dangerous—the other half is the corrective; the whole truth alone is safe. If we say the Sabbath is shadow, this is only half the truth. The Apostle adds, "the body is of Christ."

'There is, then, in the Sabbath that which is shadowy and that which is substantial, that which is transient and that which is permanent, that which is temporal and typical, and that which is eternal.'

. . . . . .

'There is in the Sabbath a substance, a permanent something —"a body"—which cannot pass away.

'"The body is of Christ"; the spirit of Christ is the fulfilment of the law. To have the spirit of Christ is to have fulfilled the law. Let us hear the mind of Christ in this matter. "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." In that principle, rightly understood, lies the clue for the unravelling of the whole matter. The religionists of that day maintained that the necessities of man's nature must give way to the rigour of the enactment: He taught that the enactment must yield to man's necessities. They said that the Sabbath was written in the book of the Law: He said it was written on man's nature, and that the Law was merely meant to be in accordance with that nature. They based the obligation to observe the Sabbath on the sacredness of the enactment; He on the sacredness of the nature of man.

'An illustration will help us to perceive the difference between these two views. A wise physician prescribes a regimen of diet to a palate which has become diseased; he fixes what shall be eaten, the quantity, the hours, and number of times. On what does the obligation to obey rest? On the arbitrary authority of the physician? or on the nature with which that prescription is in accordance? When soundness and health are restored, the prescription falls into disuse; but the nature remains unalterable, which has made some things nutritious, others unwholesome, and excess for ever pernicious. Thus the spirit of the prescrip-

tion may be still in force when the prescriptive authority is repealed.

'So Moses prescribed the Sabbath to a nation spiritually diseased. He gave the regimen of rest to men who did not feel the need of spiritual rest. He fenced round his rule with precise regulations of detail—one day in seven, no work, no fire, no traffic. On what does the obligation to obey it rest? On the authority of the rule? or on the necessities of that nature for which the rule was divinely adapted? Was man made for the Sabbath, to obey it as a slave, or was the Sabbath made for man? And when spiritual health has been restored, the law regulating the details of rest may become obsolete; but the nature which demands rest never can be reversed.' [1]

'It would, I think, be very just and reverent to conclude that if God surrounded a law with temporary characteristics, such as those which invested the law of the Sabbath under the Mosaic dispensation, these same characteristics, when ceasing to form part of the law, must continue to form a commentary on the law and an illustration of its meaning and intent. For they too proceeded from God, whose design and purpose could not but be one and the same throughout; and the means which He took to guard the law, and to secure it against temporary dangers of disobedience or forgetfulness must at least throw light upon the general drift and nature of the law itself.'

. . . . . .

'Sunday has been invariably, and in every part of the Christian Church, recognised as the weekly feast of the Resurrection, the weekly representation of the ancient holy day of rest which the Lord sanctified at the Creation.

'What then are we to conclude? Is it to be said that the sanctity of the Jewish Sabbath was transferred from the Saturday to the Sunday? Such language is, I think, entirely unknown to the Christian writers of antiquity, though it is sometimes incautiously used by more modern divines, who thereby lay themselves, and their cause, open to unnecessary objections. Besides that, there is no date, nor time that can be fixed, nor

[1] F. W. Robertson, *The Shadow and Substance of the Sabbath*, pp. 85-87, 91 and 92. (1869.)

Scripture text, nor Church-law which can be alleged to prove any such tranfer.

'The Jewish Sabbath died out in the course of the first generation of Christians, as circumcision died out, as the Temple, as the Law itself died out; and that so completely that though the first generation could not, and did not, disown the sanctity of these things, yet to have required the old reverence and obedience to them from after-generations would have been to lay them open to the strong reproof of S. Paul in the fifth chapter of Galatians: "Behold, I, Paul, say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace." As baptism did not arise by transfer from circumcision, nor the Church from the Temple, nor the Christian Law from the Jewish Law, but the old true things decayed and died away by the side of the new and truer things, so the Lord's Day sprang up and grew, an immemorial festival in the Church, all the more binding for having neither word nor date to mark its origin, by the side of the doomed and perishing Jewish Sabbath. It was one of the first principles of the common law of Christianity. It was a diviner and more immortal shoot from the same stock. It was rooted in the primitive Law of the Creation. It recognised and adopted the old weekly division of time, that perpetual and ever-recurring acknowledgment, as has been before observed, wherever it was celebrated in all the world, of the Divine blessing and promise. It had the Divine sanction of the Tables of Stone; these Tables, written by God's own finger, and therefore greatly superior in sanctity and enduring weight to the temporary enactments of the ceremonial law. It took up the old series of commemorations and sacred anticipations. It bade the true Israel of God record with gratitude, and keep in mind by the weekly institution and its recurring festival of rest and praise, the Creation of Mankind, the Deliverance from Egypt, the Entrance of the People into the Promised Land, the Return from Captivity, the Coming of the Messiah; and to look forward under the Dispensation of the Holy Ghost to the crowning and final mercy of the long scheme of Provi-

dence, the eternal rest in heaven which yet remaineth for the people of God.

'Such then is the Christian Law of the Fourth Commandment. The immediate authority on which it rests is the authority of the unwritten tradition of the Church, tracing back to the lordship over the Sabbath claimed and exercised by our Lord Himself. But it has also the authority of the Tables of Stone and the finger of God thereon, and the Primeval Law, which in that very claim of lordship Christ recognised. The Primeval Law and the Tables of Stone had ordered the sanctification of the seventh day. The Christian Law sanctifies the first; and borrows so much from the former laws as is compatible with this change.'[1]

'All men know that the formal regulations which defend property are relaxed as the ties of love and mutual understanding are made strong; that to enter unannounced is not a trespass, that the same action which will be prosecuted as a theft by a stranger, and resented as a liberty by an acquaintance, is welcomed as a graceful freedom, almost as an endearment by a friend. And yet the commandment and the rights of property hold good: they are not compromised, but glorified by being spiritualised. As it is between man and his brother, so it should be between us and our Divine Father. We have learned to know Him very differently from those who shuddered under Sinai; the whole law is not now written upon tables of stone, but upon the fleshy tables of the heart. But among the precepts which are thus etherialised and yet established, why should not the Fourth Commandment retain its place? Why should it be supposed that it must vanish from the Decalogue, unless the gathering of sticks deserves stoning? The institution, and the ceremonial application of it to Jewish life, are entirely different things; just as respect for property is a fixed obligation, while the laws of succession vary.'[2]

[1] *Law of the Love of God*, Bishop Moberly, pp. 191, 200-203.

[2] Dr. Chadwick in *Expositor's Bible*: the Book of Exodus, p. 308.

CHAPTER IV

MODERN DAYS

I

For the years following the Restoration, Canon Overton, whose intimate knowledge of the period is well recognised, contributes the following notes :—

'There was, perhaps, no period in the history of the English Church when the Sunday question was more satisfactorily and more adequately dealt with than in the latter part of the seventeenth and the earlier part of the eighteenth centuries, that is, roughly speaking, between 1660 and 1714. In the first place, it was the age of great divines: *Clerus Anglicanus, stupor mundi.* Therefore, the matter was boulted to the bran; difficulties were not slurred over, but well faced and disposed of by thoroughly competent persons. Again, the pendulum having swung now to one side, now to the other, was finding an equilibrium; those who, in defiance of Scripture and antiquity, had confounded the Jewish Sabbath with the Christian Lord's Day, had naturally provoked a reaction; or at any rate had led English Churchmen to dwell more on

the negative than on the positive side of the question; to insist upon what the "Easter Day in every week" was *not*, rather on what it *was*. But now the balance seemed to be re-adjusted, and the subject placed upon its proper footing. The weekly holy day was recognised as a Christian festival, not as a Jewish fast; the true key-note of its observance sounded, that is, worship, not rest, though, of course, for worship, rest from secular work was absolutely necessary.'

. . . 'We have evidence also that practice was not far behind theory. Never were the churches better filled, nor the attempts to secure the observance of the Lord's Day more vigorous than during this half century. It was characteristic of the age that some of these attempts were made rather too much at the point of the bayonet, as it were, but the intention was excellent. There was never any idea of reviving the *Book of Sports* of James I. and Charles I., "out of pious care for the service of God." On the contrary, a Bill was passed in the early years of Charles II.'s reign "for the better observance of the Sabbath," which, however, was missing when it should have received the royal assent. In 1662, "the Bishop of London gave a very strict order against boats going on Sundays"; in 1663 a proclamation was issued against Sunday travelling; in 1677 a Parliamentary statute prohibited all travelling and trading on the Lord's Day; in 1690 Queen Mary (in the absence of King William) "forbade all hackney carriages and horses to work on Sundays,

and had constables stationed at the corners of the streets to capture all puddings on their way to bakers' ovens on Sundays"; but this was going too far, and all but led to a riot. The Societies for the Reformation of Manners spurred on the civil authorities to enforce the laws against Sunday desecration, and "seldom," writes a pamphleteer in 1771, "has greater vigilance been used by the civil magistrate to secure religious observance of the Lord's Day." Perhaps the most notable instance was in 1710, when the Lord Chancellor, Harcourt, was actually stopped by the constable when travelling on Sunday through Abingdon in the time of Divine Service, and, instead of resenting the liberty, ordered his coachman to drive to church, when he attended the rest of the service.'

For an almost ideal Sunday in the first half of the seventeenth century, we may turn to the story of Little Gidding—a chapter of history familiar to many from the pages of *John Inglesant*. The life of that devout and strictly ordered household was planned on semi-monastic lines, and was the nearest approach to the Religious life existing in England in those days.

The following is a picture of their Sunday: 'They rose at the same hour as in the week; but after the early morning office, they retired again to their own rooms, and remained in privacy till nine o'clock, when the bell called them to matins. Having sung a hymn together in the great chamber, they went, as on week days, in procession to the church, all dressed carefully

in their best clothes; and after the service, which was read by Nicholas, they returned to find the "Psalm-children" awaiting them. The time till half-past ten was spent in instructing them, or hearing them repeat their former lessons, and at that hour the vicar of Steeple Gidding, having already said matins in his own church, arrived, accompanied by his parishioners, who apparently followed him straight from the church door, a pleasant quarter of an hour's walk across the fields. The Little Gidding family, bringing with them the Psalm-children, met him at the church, and Nicholas Ferrar read the ante-Communion service. At its close a Psalm was sung, and then the vicar preached. Once a month, and on great festivals, the Holy Communion was celebrated.

'On returning from church, their first care was for the Psalm-children. A long, narrow table, supported on trestles, was laid in some convenient place, round which the children stood expectant, while Mrs. Ferrar, with her own hands, set the first dish on the table, the servants following. When grace had been said for the children, the old lady and her family went to their own dinner, leaving only one or two to superintend the Psalm-children, who, when they had finished their meal, were sent home to go with their parents to their own parish churches.

'When the family had dined, they went to their own rooms, or refreshed themselves with a quiet walk in the gardens and orchards, as they pleased, and at

two o'clock all met together again and went to Steeple Gidding church for evensong. On Sunday the private offices were not said at the usual hours, but all together on returning from evening service, after which the remainder of the day was given up to rest and recreation. The servants of the house were carefully considered. Nicholas Ferrar so ordered that what was for dinner should all be performed with the least and speediest loss of time as might be; that was, by causing ovens to be heated, and all the dinner to be set into them by church time, and so all the servants were ready to go to church, not any left at home. And for supper, church ended in the evening, then the spits were laid for meat to be roasted at the fire. And one thing besides will not be amiss to be recounted concerning the servants. It was the custom of that family that, having a Communion the first Sunday of each month throughout the year (besides the great festival times, Christmas, New Year's Day, Easter, and Whitsuntide), they stood at the lower end of the board where the old gentlewoman sat, and there they dined that day.'[1]

Towards the end of the seventeenth century, religious societies of churchmen began to be formed in London, and from London extended themselves to the country. The members of these societies bound themselves to a holy and religious life, to receive the Holy Eucharist at least once a month, and to carry out Church principles. One outcome of the founding of

[1] *Life of Nicholas Ferrar*, edited by Rev. T. T. Carter, pp. 128-130.

these societies was that the Holy Communion was celebrated every Sunday, and sermons preached in many of the London churches to prepare people for receiving the Holy Eucharist.

II

With the eighteenth century came a grievous falling away. Religious fervour sank to its lowest ebb. The State had so paralysed the Church as to render it to a great extent powerless. Bishops were appointed on political grounds, and the lives of the clergy, generally speaking, were utterly unspiritual. Learned books were written, and the fundamental doctrines of the faith were ably and zealously defended; but it is not a time in which we expect to find either lofty ideals, or much practical energy.[1]

We are not therefore surprised, when we turn to the pages of Addison's *Spectator*, to find such a quaint and unconventional setting forth of the benefits of Sunday as the following:—

'I am always very well pleased with a country Sunday, and think, if keeping holy the seventh day were only a human institution, it would have been the best method that could have been thought of for the polishing and civilising of mankind. It is certain that country people would soon degenerate into a kind of

[1] Canon Overton writes: 'During the early part of the Georgian era there was much greater laxity in this, as in all other religious observances.'

savages and barbarians, were there not such frequent returns of a stated time, in which the whole village meet together with their best faces, and in their cleanliest habits, to converse with one another upon indifferent subjects, hear their duties explained to them, and join together in adoration of the Supreme Being. Sunday clears away the rust of the whole week, not only as it refreshes in their minds the notions of religion, but as it puts both the sexes upon appearing in their most agreeable forms, and exerting all such qualities as are apt to give them a figure in the eye of the village. A country fellow distinguishes himself as much in the churchyard as a citizen does upon the 'Change, the whole parish politics being generally discussed in that place either after sermon or before the bell rings.'

Such a view may not be very elevated or spiritual, but it is evident that even in those days of diminishing fervour Sunday was a reality in the lives of English men and women.[1]

The words which follow show moreover a reverent care for God's house worthy of all praise :—

'My friend, Sir Roger, being a good churchman, has beautified the inside of his church with several texts of his own choosing; he has likewise given a handsome pulpit cloth, and railed in the Communion Table at his own expense. He has often told me that at his coming to his estate he found his parishioners

[1] See Appendix F.

very irregular, and that in order to make them kneel and join in the responses he gave every one of them a hassock and a Common Prayer Book; and at the same time employed an itinerant singing master, who goes about the country for that purpose, to instruct them rightly in the tunes of the Psalms; upon which they now very much value themselves, and indeed outdo most of the country churches that I have ever heard.'[1]

One of the strongest and most typical churchmen of the eighteenth century is Dr. Johnson. Here and there in Boswell's *Life* we come upon the expression of his opinion and notes as to his practice in the matter of Sunday observance.

'Sunday,' said he, 'was a heavy day to me when I was a boy. My mother confined me on that day and made me read *The Whole Duty of Man*, from a great part of which I could derive no instruction. . . . The church at Lichfield, in which we had a seat, wanted reparation, so I was to go and find a seat in other churches; and having bad eyes, and being awkward about this, I used to go and read in the fields on Sunday. This habit continued until my fourteenth year, and still I find a great reluctance to go to church.'[2]

Under the year 1755 we find the following entry in Boswell: 'On the 13th [of July] he wrote in his Journal the following scheme of life for Sunday. "Having lived" (as he with tenderness of conscience expresses himself) "not without an habitual reverence for the

[1] Addison's *Spectator*, No. 112. [2] Boswell's *Johnson*, date 1729.

Sabbath, yet without that attention to its religious duties which Christianity requires:

'"1. To rise early; and in order to it, to go to sleep early on Saturday.

'"2. To use some extraordinary devotion in the morning.

'"3. To examine the tenor of my life, and particularly the last week; and to mark my advances in religion, or recession from it.

'"4. To read the Scriptures methodically with such helps as are at hand.

'"5. To go to church twice.

'"6. To read books of divinity, either speculative or practical.

'"7. To instruct my family.

'"8. To wear off by meditation any worldly soil contracted in the week."'

On another occasion he said to Boswell, 'I do not like to read anything on Sunday but what is theological; not that I would scrupulously refuse to look at anything which a friend should shew me in a newspaper; but in general I would read only what is theological.'[1]

In regard to the period of the Evangelical revival, Canon Overton writes: 'One of the results was a stricter observance of the Lord's Day. The Methodist

[1] *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides*: Sunday, 17th October. For an allegorical sketch of the history of Sunday in Johnson's *Rambler*, see Appendix F.

movement was of course all in favour of the change, and so too was the Evangelical movement within the Church. No one was more active in this direction than the first bishop who can at all be regarded as belonging to the Evangelical party, Dr. Beilby Porteus. When he became Bishop of London in 1787, he used his great influence in and about the metropolis to promote a better observance of the Lord's Day. He waged war against the Sunday Debating Societies, which were abused for the purpose of ventilating sceptical views, Sunday promenades which were too often made scenes for assignation, and private concerts on Sunday by professionals;[1] and he had the moral courage to carry his crusade into the highest quarters, remonstrating both with the king and the heir apparent when he thought their examples did not tend to edification. Oddly enough, he was more successful with the irreligious son than with the religious father; for he persuaded the former to alter the day of meeting of the Sunday clubs which he patronised, but could not persuade the latter to put a stop to the Sunday bands at Windsor, Kensington, and Weymouth. As might be expected, the attempts to bring about a better observance of the Lord's Day, which were the results of the Evangelical revival, were not made on quite the same ground as those of the more definite churchmen of the earlier period.

[1] One whose recollections of the period are clear adds that the bishop did not hesitate to attack even the old ladies' card tables.

The 'New Puritans,' as they were not very accurately termed, did not discriminate so clearly between the Sabbath and the Lord's Day, using the terms promiscuously; but it is a mistake to suppose that they reproduced the views of the Sabbatarians of the seventeenth century. Richard Cecil, who was one of their most thoughtful and cultivated representatives, drew a marked distinction between the bright cheerfulness of the Christian festival and the austere gloom[1] of the Jewish fast; and Bishop Porteus, Bishop Barrington, Hannah More, and other leading Evangelicals took the same line. This important subject, however, was not placed on the same distinctly Church basis in the late years of the eighteenth century as it had been in those of the seventeenth, and the writings on the point are not nearly so weighty, therefore it is hardly necessary to quote them.'

III

That the efforts made to promote a better observance

[1] It may be well to draw attention to the fact that the idea held by the writers of that day as to the 'austere gloom' of the Jewish Sabbath does not tally with facts, as is shown by the following extract :—

'It was not looked on as a day of gloom, or a burden by those who lived under it. Dr. Driver quotes the following words from Schechter: "The Sabbath is celebrated by the very people who did observe it, in hundreds of hymns, which would fill volumes, as a day of rest and joy, of pleasure and delight, a day in which a man enjoys some presentiment of the pure bliss and happiness which are stored up for the righteous in the world to come. To it such tender names were applied as the 'Queen Sabbath,' the 'Bride Sabbath,' and the 'holy, dear, beloved Sabbath.'" '—Dr. Driver in Hastings's *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. iv. s.v. *Sabbath*.

of the Lord's Day in the period just spoken of led to any marked improvement in that which followed seems more than doubtful—at least so far as the children were concerned.

Readers of *Præterita*, for instance, will recollect the gloomy picture that Mr. Ruskin gives of the Sundays of his childhood, in the early years of the nineteenth century:—

'Luckily for me, my mother, under these distinct impressions of her own duty, and with such latent hopes of my future eminence, took me very early to church; where, in spite of my quiet habits, and my mother's golden vinaigrette always indulged to me there, and there only, with its lid unclasped that I might see the wreathed open pattern above the sponge, I found the bottom of the pew so extremely dull a place to keep quiet in (my best story books being also taken away from me in the morning), that, as I have somewhere said before, the horror of Sunday used even to cast its prescient gloom as far back in the week as Friday—and all the glory of Monday, with church seven days removed again, was no equivalent for it. . . . It now began to be of some importance what church I went to on Sunday mornings. My father, who was still much broken in health, could not go to the long Church of England service, and my mother being Evangelical, he went contentedly, or at least submissively, with her and me to the Beresford Chapel, Walworth, where the Rev. D. Andrews

preached regularly a somewhat eloquent, forcible and ingenious sermon, not tiresome to him; the prayers were abridged from the Church service, and we, being the grandest people in the congregation, were allowed—though, as I now remember, not without offended and reproachful glances from the more conscientious worshippers—to come in when even those short prayers were half over. Mary and I used each to write an abstract of the sermon in the afternoon, to please ourselves—Mary dutifully, and I to show how well I could do it. We never went to church in the afternoon or evening. I remember yet the amazed and appalling sensation, as of a vision preliminary to the Day of Judgment, of going, a year or two later, first into a church by candlelight.

'We had no family worship, but our servants were better cared for than is often the case in ostentatiously religious houses. . . . The gloom, and even the error, with which the restrictions of the Sunday, and the doctrines of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, the *Holy War*, and Quarles' *Emblems*, oppressed the seventh part of my time, was useful to me as the only form of vexation which I was called on to endure; and redeemed by the otherwise uninterrupted cheerfulness and tranquillity of a household wherein the common ways were all of pleasantness, and its single and straight path of perfect peace.'

There seem to have been slight relaxations when they were on their travels, but still strictness prevailed. 'We never travelled on Sunday; my father and I

nearly always went—as philosophers—to Mass in the morning, and my mother in pure good nature to us (I scarcely ever saw in her a trace of feminine curiosity) would join with us in some such profanity as a drive on the Corso, or the like, in the afternoon. But we all, even my father, liked a walk in the fields better, round an Alpine chalet village.' . . . 'So I read my chapter with him morning and evening; and if there were no English Church on Sundays, the Morning Service, Litany and all, very reverently; after which we enjoyed ourselves each in our own way in the afternoon, George being always free, and Couttet, if he chose; but he had little taste for the Sunday promenades in a town, and was glad if I would take him with me to gather flowers, or carry stones. I never till this time had thought of travelling, climbing or sketching on the Sunday; the first infringement of this rule by climbing the isolated peak above Gap, with both Couttet and George, after our morning service, remains a weight on my conscience to this day. But it was thirteen years later before I made a sketch on Sunday.'[1]

Another indication of the difficulty that was felt at the time as to making children keep Sunday may be found in the *Christian Observer* of 1823, where 'R. H.' 'solicits the opinion of experienced correspondents on the manner in which young children should be trained to keep the Sabbath.'[2] He wishes specially to be in-

[1] *Præterita*, i. pp. 21, 95, 158, 188; ii. 162. (1899.)
[2] See Appendix F.

formed 'whether their day should be decidedly marked off from all the rest of the week by a prohibition of all the usual plays and amusements of young children; and if so, how the prohibition may be best enforced.' '*A parent*' replies: 'With regard to the prohibition of all the usual plays and amusements of young children on the Sunday, I should think it right to enforce it as soon as a child can be made to understand the nature of the day and of the Divine command respecting it. When a child can read it becomes comparatively easy to fill up his time, and even before that period much instruction and amusement may be conveyed to his mind by one ever on the watch for his improvement.' It is comforting to find that another correspondent of the *Christian Observer* 'would not wholly forbid recreations, but would turn them to good account' . . . and says that 'a judicious mother . . . will certainly for very young children prefer even toys to quarrelling, and the fretful irritation of total inaction.'

It may be that the fear here expressed of anything like a natural and healthy Sunday led to that vigorous rebellion against any observance of Sunday which appears to have been gaining ground at this time.

The best side of this period is represented by the following letters received from one whose links with the Macaulay family are many: 'In the early part of the nineteenth century, before 1815, Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Thornton, and others, Members of Parliament, had town houses and beautiful villas at Clapham Common.

They always went out to these villas from Saturday to Monday during the session. They assembled numbers of friends there, generally literary people and political friends. They attended Clapham Church twice on Sunday, and admired the sermons of the rector, the Rev. John Venn. The rest of the day was spent in walking, conversation, and reading aloud. My grandfather writes constantly of the great refreshment these Sundays were, owing to the entire change of thought they afforded and the delightful services at Clapham Church.'

The following gives a vivid picture of a Sunday in the forties. 'The custom of my grandfather, Z. Macaulay, was to keep open house for all young relations and friends on Sunday, who came whenever they pleased to spend the day. There were always a good many there besides his own nine children, so the party was cheerful. They all went to church morning and afternoon, and enjoyed much the sermons, which were much studied then, and also the services and hymns. But what tried the young people was that my grandfather insisted on all being present when he read a sermon between the mid-day meal and afternoon church, and again when he read one at evening prayers. My aunts and mother taught regularly in the Sunday schools which my grandfather had helped in establishing.'

Such letters as this represent the best side of Sunday; they show the result of the Evangelical revival. No doubt throughout the country there were many homes

where such a state of things prevailed. But it would be a mistake to think that there was no other. The pen of Charles Dickens (writing in 1855) has painted as gloomy a picture of a Sunday in London, and as sad a reminiscence of a child's Sunday, as could well be.

'It was a Sunday evening in London, gloomy, close, and stale. Maddening church bells of all degrees of dissonance, sharp and flat, cracked and clear, fast and slow, made the bricks and mortar echoes hideous. Melancholy streets, in a penitential garb of soot, steeped the souls of the people, who were condemned to look at them out of windows, in dire despondency. In every thoroughfare, up almost every alley, and down almost every turning, some doleful bell was throbbing, jerking, tolling, as if the plague were in the city and the dead-carts were going round. Everything was bolted and barred that could by any possibility furnish relief to an over-worked people. No pictures, no unfamiliar animals, no rare plants or flowers, no natural or artificial wonders of the ancient world—all *taboo* with such enlightened strictness that the ugly South Sea gods in the British Museum might have supposed themselves at home again. Nothing to see but streets, streets, streets. Nothing to change the brooding mind, or raise it up. Nothing for the spent toiler to do, but to compare the monotony of his seventh day with the monotony of his six days, think what a weary life he had and make the best of it—or the worst, according to the probabilities.

'Mr. Arthur Clennam sat in the window of the coffee-house on Ludgate Hill, counting one of the neighbouring bells, making sentences and burdens of songs out of it in spite of himself, and wondering how many sick people it might be the death of in the course of the year. As the hour approached, its changes of measure made it more and more exasperating. At the quarter it went off into a condition of deadly, lively importunity, urging the populace in a voluble manner to come to church, come to church, come to church. At the ten minutes, it became aware that the congregation would be scanty, and slowly hammered out in low spirits, they *won't* come, they *won't* come, they *won't* come! At the five minutes it abandoned hope, and shook every house in the neighbourhood for three hundred seconds with one dismal swing per second, as a groan of despair.

'"Thank Heaven!" said Clennam, when the hour struck and the bell stopped.

'But its sound had revived a long train of miserable Sundays, and the procession would not stop with the bell, but continued to march on. "Heaven forgive me and those who trained me. How I have hated this day!" There was the dreary Sunday of his childhood, when he sat with his hands before him, scared out of his senses by a horrible tract, which commenced business with the poor child by asking him in its title why he was going to perdition?—a piece of curiosity that he really in a frock and drawers was not in a condition

to satisfy—and which, for the further attraction of his infant mind, had a parenthesis in every other line with some such hiccupping reference as 2 Ep. Thess. c. ii. v. 6, 7. There was the sleepy Sunday of his boyhood, when, like a military deserter, he was marched to chapel by a picket of teachers three times a day, morally handcuffed to another boy; and when he would willingly have bartered two meals of indigestible sermon for another ounce or two of inferior mutton at his scanty dinner in the flesh. There was the interminable Sunday of his nonage; when his mother, stern of face and unrelenting of heart, would sit all day behind a Bible—bound, like her own construction of it, in the hardest, barest, and straitest boards, with one dinted ornament on the cover, like the drag of a chain, and a wrathful sprinkling of red upon the edges of the leaves—as if it, of all books, were a fortification against sweetness of temper, natural affection and gentle intercourse. There was the resentful Sunday of a little later, when he sat glowering and glooming through the tardy length of the day, with a sullen sense of injury in his heart, and no more real knowledge of the beneficent history of the New Testament than if he had been bred among idolaters. There was a legion of Sundays, all days of unserviceable bitterness and mortification, slowly passing before him.'[1]

Such a passage as this (and many such might be

[1] *Little Dorrit*, chap. iii.

gathered from books of the period) gives an idea of the prevalent spirit of Sunday in those days. Truly our forefathers had not been wholly successful in their efforts to make Sunday a reality, especially to the young.

A glance at the *Christian Observers* of the early years of the nineteenth century confirms the impression that anything like a real observance of Sunday was then largely breaking down. Many and deep are the lamentations, for instance, over a military band at Brighton in 1803, to which a clergyman gave his countenance, and in 1806 over the custom of drilling soldiers on that day. Sunday newspapers are constantly attacked, and the opening of shops, or the driving of cattle; so, too, is the practice of paying labourers' wages in the mornings. In 1831 the *Record* protests against the King's Ministers holding a Cabinet meeting on that day. In 1830 we read that the 'whole subject is increasingly commanding attention in high and influential quarters. The Bishop of London in particular has nobly thrown himself into the breach by his pastoral letter to the inhabitants of his diocese, the publication of which has gained him the honour of the most virulent abuse from the irreligious and immoral portion of the press, especially the Sunday newspaper interest. The righteous and the wicked have had their attention aroused: let not then the favourable moment for action be lost; but let Christians in every part of the kingdom act promptly upon it, by remonstrance, by legislation, by

petition, by prayer, by serious warning, and by forming local committees to carry the object into effect. It is never too late and never too soon to begin.'

Some may know an interesting old book, published in 1833, called *Sunday in London, illustrated in* 14 *cuts by George Cruikshank, and a few words by a friend of his with a copy of Sir Andrew Agnew's Bill.* It is worth looking into: to the *laudator temporis acti* it has warnings. It begins with a description of Saturday night in London, and to some of us, who are apt to think that Saturday night in London is bad enough now, it may convey consolation, for things are certainly better now than they were then. The writer begins with the 'first or higher orders.'

'The last hour of Saturday night, you know well, gentle (or, perhaps, angry) reader, finds thousands of the chosen of the land—the peers—brave peers of England, pillars of the state!—the legislators—the leaders and lights of the age—the flower of the nobility —the *véritable crême du bon ton*,—where? Why, sir, where should they be, but closely box'd-up in the King's Theatre, tier above tier, head over head, "with feathered spinsters, and thrice-feathered wives," dispensing small talk, or discussing the difference between tweedle-*dum* and tweedle-*dee*, until the clock strikes twelve; and then the first hour of Sunday, the "Advent of the Sabbath of the Lord," is twirled in by the *pirouette* of the dancer! . . . Can there be a more intellectual and appropriate mode of beginning to "observe the

Sabbath"? . . . There are hells in the courtly parish of St. James, with their splendid mirrors, and oriental carpets, and rich draperies, and glittering lights, and smirking familiars, and gilded saloons in which multitudes of our nobles and gentles spend the first hours of Sunday morning in coveting other men's goods and being cheated of their own.'

Of the middle orders, he tells us that 'Multitudes begin the Sunday much after the same fashion as the higher orders, to wit, in the theatres;—and you shall find them "in masses" on the first hour of "the Sabbath," shouting and laughing and clapping their hands.'

The early hours of Sunday morning are next described. By the 'lower orders' they are devoted to the worship of the Great Spirit Gin, whose temples are full of worshippers; and 'there you may see them,—old men and maidens, grandsires and grandams, fathers and mothers, husbands, wives, and children, crowding and jostling, . . . and sucking the portions of the spirit which the flaunting priestesses of the temple dole out to them in return for their copper offerings.' Meanwhile, the streets are turned into a market, and the Sunday dinners are purchased; others of the poorer classes spend their time 'with their dogs and a bag to "recreate" themselves with a cat-hunt, or a dog-fight, or a man-fight, in the fields; whilst many others of them, less "fancy"-ful, repair to the royal park, yclep'd St. James's, to "hear the band and see the soldiers."'

As for the middle classes, 'a great mass of them observe the Sabbath by a cleaner shave, a cleaner shirt, an extra *pudd'n*, . . . a sporting Sunday paper, and a country jaunt. They profess to observe the Sabbath agreeably to the mode claimed by the hero of Dr. Sputhey's celebrated book, *Wat Tyler* viz. :—

> '"Go *thou* and seek the house of prayer,
> *I* to the woodlands will repair !"

And possibly they *may*, as Master Shakespeare says, "find tongues in trees, books in the running streams, sermons in stones, and good in everything": though we *rather guess* that the tongues they find are the *cold neats' tongues* in the larder of some surburban tavern; books in the *sporting newspapers*; sermons in *pipe-lighters*; and good in grogging themselves into a sort of comfortable *pro tem.* notion that the "*right end* of life is to live and be jolly."

'Others of the Middle Orders there are who read the fourth commandment thus—"Six days shalt thou labour and do all that thou hast to do, and on the seventh day *post* thy books." These worthy members of the Middle Order are your *main-chance* men; with them as with Pope's Sir Balaam :—

> '"What once was deemed a blessing, now is *wit*,
> And God's good providence a *lucky hit*.
> Things change their titles as our manners turn;
> The counting house employs their Sunday morn;
> Seldom at church (theirs are such busy lives)
> But duly send their families and wives."

'Doubtless there are multitudes of the Middle Orders, who, having devoted six days to their temporal interests, endeavour, as Robbie Burns says, "to keep up a correspondence wi' Heaven," by attending on the seventh day their parish church, or some other place in which people still mutually and publicly profess to worship God.'

We lament nowadays the growth of Sunday entertainments amongst the rich, but the following quotation from the same source shows that it is no new thing: 'If any man go about to affirm that the "Higher Orders" do not make this second portion of the Sabbath a time of rest (as far as their own proper persons are concerned) he goeth about to affirm that which is not true. Indeed, if the commandment in this case made and provided applied to every day in the week as well as to Sunday, the Higher Orders would never break it by doing any manner of *work*—vulgarly so called; and this particular portion of the Sunday they especially devote to profound repose . . . and your Higher Orders having wound up a whole week of the glittering and the grand —"grand" breakfasts, "grand" dinners, "grand" balls, and "grand" suppers, by a particularly "grand" opera in the first portion of the Sunday, do necessarily require an extraordinary repose during the second portion thereof; and it must be confessed that they endeavour to take that repose most profoundly.

'It is, nevertheless, most unquestionably true, that whilst this profound repose reigns undisturbed in "the

perfumed chambers of the great," the cattle and the servants within their gates, and the tradesmen on the great depending, are breaking the fourth commandment with all their might, in obedience to the orders of the great: the coachmen and the grooms and the helpers, and the young *tigers*, are washing and scrubbing the cattle and the barouches and the barouchettes, the britschas, and buggies, the carriages, and the cabs, for the afternoon-morning rides and drives; the fishmongers and poulterers are trimming the turbots and killing the quails, and the cooks and the scullions are lighting the stoves, and extracting the juices, and concocting the condiments, and graduating the gravies for the Higher Order dinner, that is to say, the "select" dinner party, the "grand" dinner party, or the "grand" cabinet dinner.'[1]

It would be wearisome to quote more—indeed, it would be difficult, for the style of the book is more suited to the manners of seventy years ago than of to-day. Enough to say that it is a scathing indictment of the society of the age.

In the year 1833 Sir Andrew Agnew's Bill was brought in with a view to improving matters. To give anything like a detailed analysis[2] of it would be beside the point, but it is so remarkable an instance

[1] It should be remembered that a book like this is a caricature, but it is sufficiently obvious that the facts are real, however vivid may be the colours in which they are painted.

[2] For a general analysis of the legislation on this subject since the seventeenth century see note at the end of this chapter.

of a piece of well meant but blundering legislation that a very brief *résumé* may not be out of place.

1. It lays down 'that it is the bounden duty of the legislature to protect every class of society against being compelled to sacrifice their comfort, health, religious privileges, and conscience, for the convenience, enjoyment, or supposed advantage of any other class on the Lord's Day.' We could have wished for nothing better had it not been that the Bill goes on to say 'except menial servants acting in the necessary service of their employers,' thus excluding from its protection the class of people who probably need it more than any other, though indeed it is hard to see how their wrongs could have been righted by legislation.

2. The Bill provides for the diminution of open Sunday trafficking, drunkenness, and debauchery, by inflicting heavy penalties on the keeping open of the gin shops or any other shops on Sunday, and by limiting the hours for the sale of intoxicating liquors. But it also prevents any person from eating any meal in any house of public entertainment, unless he has slept on the premises the night preceding. This must have made Sunday a difficult day for the large class of bachelor lodgers.

3. An effort is made by the Bill to put down Sunday travelling, heavy penalties being inflicted on the letting out to hire of any carriage, cab, gig, etc., for the purpose of travelling or going about on a Sunday; except for the purpose of attending the sick, or going to any

place of public worship. It would not be difficult to point out the absurdities of such a provision as this. They are fully detailed in the book here briefly analysed.

4. The Bill prohibits the driving of cattle to market on Sunday.[1]

Such extracts as these (and many others might be added) make it clear that at the beginning of the nineteenth century things were very bad, in spite of the efforts that had been made at reform. Many persons think that they could scarcely be worse than they are at the present day, but we cannot rival the coarseness and degradation of such a Sunday as is described in the book above quoted.

IV

Any one who is old enough to recall the early sixties will probably feel that by that time a marked improvement had taken place. Whatever may have been the case in the poorer parts of London, or indeed of any great town, in the country at least the efforts made in the early part of the century had taken effect.[2]

[1] The Bill, as one would expect, was rejected.

[2] In Sir Theodore Martin's *The Early Years of the Prince Consort*, p. 331, a memorandum by Queen Victoria is quoted, in which it is said, 'The Prince had a very strong feeling about the solemnity of this act [receiving the Holy Sacrament] and did not like to appear in company either the evening before or on the day on which he took the Sacrament; and he and the Queen almost always dined alone on these occasions.' Mr. Gladstone's strong feeling on the subject is well known. Sir Edward Hamilton in *Mr. Gladstone: a Monograph*, says,

This is borne out by the personal testimony of one well qualified to judge, who, born in the year 1812, lived through almost the whole of the nineteenth century. Leaving England in 1840, he returned at the end of 1846. On his return he found the change for the better most marked. He attributes it to the influence of the Tractarians, and in particular to that of Mr. Keble and the *Christian Year*. Probably the present generation reads and values its *Christian Year* far less than did Mr. Keble's contemporaries, and it is difficult even for those of us who value it most to understand the enthusiasm with which men of the older generation speak of it, or the effect which they ascribe to its direct influence. Bishop Blomfield may have called it 'the Sunday puzzle,' but nevertheless it influenced the nation in an almost incredible way.

There can be little doubt that by the middle of the nineteenth century there was a great improvement: yet in the last fifty years a reaction has taken place. The old restrictions have practically broken down, and the change is not confined to one stratum of society. This may be seen by any one who has to travel on Sunday. Trams, omnibuses, trains are usually full, often crowded; bicycles are ubiquitous; the Thames is

'Sunday to him was the Lord's Day—a day of rest and worship. Nothing short of urgent necessity hindered him from attending church every Sunday more than once; and he was a regular and frequent communicant. On Sundays he avoided as far as possible doing any ordinary work.' See also Appendix G.

covered with boats. For a member of a theatrical company on tour to have a quiet Sunday is a rare event; the journeys from place to place are usually carried out on that day. Although the movement for opening museums, picture galleries, etc., has not progressed as was expected, yet the number of those which are opened has considerably increased. Anything which has to be carried on in the open air, is, in our uncertain English climate, more or less at a disadvantage, but of late years the custom of having Sunday concerts in the London parks has greatly increased, and great numbers of people attend them. The multiplication of Sunday newspapers is another sign of the times.

However natural such a reaction as this may be, there can be no doubt that at the present time there is a widespread feeling amongst those who care about religious subjects that the general neglect of Sunday has reached a point which calls for anxious thought. Those who were present at the discussion on the subject at the Brighton Church Congress, in October 1901, will remember how unanimous the speakers were in deploring the condition of affairs; and letters received in the last two or three years from friends, both lay and clerical, in various parts of the country,[1] testify to the fact that there is need to consider carefully how best to meet and deal with such a spirit of change. Some

[1] For a letter and newspaper extracts describing the state of affairs in America, see Appendix H.

of the letters take, it may be, too despondent a view, and show how difficult it is, in the depression caused by the breaking-down of what we have been accustomed to all our lives, to see hopeful symptoms or to recognise the better points in the reaction.

The vicar of a country town in the south of England, who has done good work there for fourteen years, writes: 'I should say that in respect of church-going the old *fashion* of going to church on Sunday has been dying, and is nearly extinct here. Those who go to church go not from custom so much as from inclination or duty, and so far the value of their attendance is greater. Here the average attendance of communicants has increased. . . . The communicants are mostly women. . . . On the whole, church-going is not at all satisfactory here, nor, as far as I can learn, anywhere in this district. . . . With regard to the observance of Sunday apart from church-going—the Sunday school tends to diminish. The number of ladies willing to teach decreases, and the bigger lads are less ready to attend a Bible class. Amusements increase, *e.g.*, lawn tennis and luncheon parties; but I notice especially an increased use of the train to take people away and to bring people here, mostly, I think, relations. Unfortunately an evening train stops here soon after the conclusion of the evening service, and many Church people stay at home to see their friends and give them supper preparatory to the departure of the train. . . . I am afraid I have many working men

in my parish who have not even Sunday clothes, and who pay no observance to Sunday, except to stay in bed in the morning, and eat more than they do on other days, and have better food. It is indifference, not hostility, to religion. Yet notwithstanding all this, I fear my parish is not an example of a particularly bad one, and that what I have to say of this place would be found to be generally true of most other parishes round here.'

From a mining parish in the north of England comes the following: 'I think in England we are getting the continental Sunday without the Mass first, so that we are in a very unsatisfactory state. . . . People have outgrown (mentally) the Protestant idea of Sunday, but have often only got a pagan idea instead of it.'

From a town parish in the north a friend writes: 'So far as the lower (so-called) classes amongst whom my ministerial experience has been gained, I regretfully state that Sunday observance is nothing like so general as it was five-and-twenty years ago. Selfishness is at the root of this defect. People are so taken up with the "cares and pleasures" of this life that they allow the thought of the other life to fall quite into the background, if it has any place at all. Prosperous times have tended to bring about the present state of things.'

One who knows the East End of London well writes: 'Among the quite lower classes bicycling and

the cheap trains take the people out of London for the whole day. They lie late in bed — then the pink sporting newspaper goes round to every house in the poor streets in the East End, and then the whole population who can afford it go off to Epping Forest. They seem many of them never to enter a place of worship. Some of the dissenting ministers in the East End tell me that their large chapels, which ten years ago were crowded in the evenings, are now quite empty, not fifteen people in them often.'

The same friend writes of the class above this: 'Any one who speaks of Sunday being quiet in England should go down the Thames from Windsor to Richmond Bridge on a Sunday afternoon in July, and I think he would be amazed. The shopkeepers and clerk class are there in masses, the class who formerly spent quiet Sundays, read Sunday books, and took a walk as their relaxation.'

The vicar of a riverside parish on the Thames writes: 'An island opposite here is crowded all Sunday afternoon—teas, kettle-boilings, etc. I once counted one hundred omnibuses round Hampton Court Green. There is a tremendous lot of Sunday labour. Sunday is the harvest for our boat-builders, of whom we have several; for our hotels, of which we have fifteen, all close together; and for our cooks and charwomen, while boys pick up no end by holding horses, and taking care of boats and bicycles. It lasts from Good Friday till the end of September or October according to the

weather. It does not tell very much upon Sunday school, or morning congregations. It kills the evening service, which is very full in winter.'

Of the richer classes one writer says: 'I think the afternoon services being given up in country churches has broken the habit of the upper classes going twice to church. As a girl when I stayed in country homes, and in my early married life, most people went to church and only took a walk after attending afternoon service. Now no one goes to evening service.'

A parish priest whose work lies amongst the rich says: 'I am quite satisfied that the spirit of Laodicean indifference is rapidly on the increase amongst all classes.'

Another writes about 'the elaborate Sunday luncheons and dinners. One or two houses in this street have the latter constantly—carriages waiting and cabs whistled for up to midnight and later.'

The following extract expresses in so racy a way this attitude of a certain section of society towards Sunday, and the contrast with the past, that it is quoted here, by the permission of the writer.[1]

'The observance of Sunday when I first knew society was in greater or less degree almost universal. Now it hardly exists. Smart people in London generally go away from Saturday till Monday, and in the country houses where they spend their "week-ends" Sunday is completely secularised. The keener spirits play "bridge" in the garden, and in the

[1] *An Onlooker's Note-book*, pp. 175 ff, 183 ff.

evening billiards and cards have effectually displaced those ivory letters which were the extreme limit of the gaiety permitted by our fathers. . . . I perfectly remember the time when a walk on Sunday afternoon to the kitchen-garden, or the home farm, was the only form of exercise permitted. Even children were not allowed to run, or shout, or play. I have known a schoolboy scolded for giving an apple to his pony. Only "Sunday books" might be read; others were put away on Saturday evening. No newspaper might enter the doors. Drawing and needlework were crimes which might be expected to bring the chandelier down upon one's guilty head. Even the piano might not be opened, except to accompany hymn-singing after dinner, or at family prayers. . . . The few people who stay in London on Sunday compensate themselves for their stationariness by doing all they can in the way of society-parading in the park, driving into the country, dining at hotels or suburban clubs. Every one has a luncheon party on Sunday; it is the favourite night for dinners. . . . Church-going is of course a department of the observance of Sunday, and it has gone pretty nearly with the rest. The leaders of fashion, as far as I can observe, do not go to church at all. . . . The moment breakfast is over the "week-end" party will divide itself into two sections; the keener spirits betake themselves to cards, and eagerly win or patiently lose their money till the gong goes for luncheon. . . . But while the money-spinners are sorting their cards

under the cedar-tree, the more wholesome natures are laying their plans of exercise. If there are any hacks available, a riding party will be organised. A procession of carriages and traps will come to the door directly after luncheon, and bowl the party over to tea at a ten-mile-distant neighbour's. A troop of bicycles (the cleaning of which has become a serious element in the economy of a country house) whirls down the avenue. If we are near a river, a peaceful afternoon may be spent in a punt, or a hard-hearted young lady compels her swains to bend their unwilling backs to the laborious oar. Lawn tennis is no longer a passion, but it has its uses as a freshener of the appetite, and those of us who are no longer quite as young as we were toddle cheerfully round the croquet ground. If it happens to be wet, the votaries of bridge and whist are reinforced. Billiards and pool are better than doing nothing, and even "ping-pong" has its heroes and its victims, its failures and its triumphs. No one would give a ball on Sunday evening; but if you have a lot of boys and girls in the house, and the gallery floor happens to be polished, there can be no harm in the Washington Post or the Kitchen Lancers; and really Freddy Du Cane plays waltzes so beautifully that it would be a sin to waste his talents.'

If it is true that great changes have occurred in England, it is even more true of Scotland.

The following extracts from the letter of a well-

known professor in one of the Scottish Universities must find a place here:—

'There is everywhere widespread uncertainty as to how the day should be observed, and while the church remains silent the people are taking matters into their own hands. The breakdown of our over-rigid Sabbatarianism, if it has brought a diminution of hypocrisy, has also bred a good deal of unhallowed licence, a marked falling off in the attendance at divine service, the almost total discontinuance, I fear, of home religious instruction, and a great deal of unnecessary work. In Aberdeen it was recently reported that about four hundred shops (mostly for ice-cream) are now open on Sunday. . . . The working classes can hardly be got to attend church before 2 P.M. . . . Scotland cannot any longer be called Sabbatarian.'

Through the kindness of a friend in Scotland, the writer is able to give further letters on this subject. They are but brief cuttings, extracted from a considerable correspondence on the subject, and as most of the writers have expressed a wish that their names should not be mentioned, it seems better to print them all anonymously.

'In regard to the Sunday, the following are facts in Scotland of to-day, in the "peopled" districts at all events, as compared with twenty-five years ago: No trams ran on Sunday then; they do now. No, or almost no, vehicles, coaches, etc., ran on Sunday for sightseers; they do now. The streets on the Sabbath

were comparatively quiet in the afternoon; now they are thronged with people. The attendance of people at church in proportion to the population has gone down thirty per cent., I should think. The attendance of people in church in proportion to the number of church members has gone down twenty per cent.—in many places much more. For every hundred people who attended church twice a day twenty-five years ago, there will not be more than forty, or at most fifty, now who do so. Sunday steamers ply regularly on the Firth of Forth as pleasure steamers all Sunday. Such a thing was unknown twenty-five years ago, and there is likewise a great increase of railway travelling. Many more shops are open on Sunday than before. Labour in the streets and by public bodies is much commoner. The belief that the Sabbath is God's appointed day of rest, and still more that it is the Lord's Day, and is therefore profaned if the Lord is not honoured on that day of worship—this belief has passed largely from the public mind. There has been moral deterioration in consequence. The sense of being under authority, which is the essence of religious life, is greatly weakened through the diminished recognition of the authority of the Fourth Commandment.'

The above letter is quoted because of its interest, although, as those who have read the previous pages will recognise, the view of Sunday taken by the writer of the letter is of a somewhat different tendency from that taken in this book.

The next letter is from a medical man of high standing, and of much thought:—'As to the Sunday of my youth, I look back on it as a weariness. Our family Sunday observance was not quite so rigid as that of most of our friends. I speak of from 1843 to 1856. My Sunday life was as follows: Family prayers and breakfast at 8. From 9 till 10.30 the *Shorter Catechism* and portions of Scripture were learned by heart. 11 to 1, church. Between services we never left the house, and all reading was confined to such books as the *Christian Herald*. I am thankful to say the *Pilgrim's Progress* was not forbidden, and my intimacy with that glorious book became very great. 3 to 4.30, afternoon church. From 4 to 5 the whole family took a short walk along the Dean Bridge road. In doing this I can assure you we were regarded as rather advanced people, and my guardians were often requested to consider the propriety of their action. After dinner, from 6.30 to 9 the *Shorter Catechism* had to be gone through, with proofs, the first half one Sunday, the second the next. Then a sermon was read; at 9.30 family prayers with another sermon, and then bed. No music was allowed, though my aunt was a good pianist; nothing like recreation was permitted, and, as I have said, the day was a weariness to me and all young people. There was a true story of one of Sir A—— B——'s sons. Sir A—— was of the strictest sect. Some friend asked the boy which day of the week he liked best. He

answered "Monday." "Why?" "Because it is furthest from Sunday." At the time I speak of, many people kept their blinds down all day, and never left the house except to go to church, had cold meals, and restricted the work of the servants as much as possible. The same state of matters obtained during the "Preachings," *i.e.*, at the time of the bi-yearly Communion. This, if I remember right, in Edinburgh was in April and November, lasting from Thursday till Monday. On Thursday, the Fast Day, everything was the same as on Sunday; on Saturday one service, as also on Monday. It must be remembered that with the Disruption of 1843 there was a recrudescence of Puritanism, each sect vying with the other in rigidity of outward observance. This, I believe, had a good deal to do with the straitness of the earlier years of my boyhood, and I think even before the end of the period I speak of things were somewhat relaxed. I was abroad between 1856 and 1863. On my return I found matters very much changed; the ties of Sunday discipline were very much loosened, and there was much more liberty of action. Men and women could exercise their own judgment in such matters without censure. How or why this rapid change occurred I could never account for, the most extraordinary thing being its rapidity. You can judge from your own experience of the difference between this period and the one which I have pictured. In many of the remoter parts of Scotland Sunday discipline is still very strict.'

The writer of the following letter is one who has given much careful thought to such subjects. His comments suggest valuable lines of thought as to the duties of the Church in the matter:—

'From a Christian point of view there is no objection that I can see to any individual adopting the old strict practice in regard to Sunday. It is much easier to defend that than to justify the modern laxity. But the old way quite failed to gain the adhesion of the rising generation. Hardly one—I believe I might say not one—of my contemporaries who were brought up under it continued to practise it when they became free agents; perhaps it would have been better if we had. But although there was much that was admirable in the old way, it had defects, as anything that men do has. So far as it has failed, I think its failure was due to two things.

'1. We were taught that a great many things were "wrong" which are not in themselves wrong. As we grew up we began to see that some of these things were not altogether wrong, but that much that was good was connected with them. This made it difficult for us to make a stand about anything, and tended to produce laxity about things in regard to which it would have been better to be strict. . . .

'2. It was a mistake to try to force a line of conduct on young people which could only be healthy and natural if freely adopted. A kind of exotic or hothouse religion was thus cultivated in the young which could

not stand when they went out into the cold atmosphere of the world, as young people must do some time. . . .

'We cannot reproduce the past. It has served its purpose and has gone. There is no use in trying to revive the Scottish Sabbath, or the forms of worship of the fifteenth, or any other century, or the cathedral system, or the Sunday school. All these things need to be overhauled and adapted to the times in which we live. I do not mean that they should be made pleasant for thoughtless people. But if there is any good in them, then they may be required to demonstrate it by bringing people under the influence of religion. For is not that the mission of the Church? And if she fails to bring in the people then she fails in her mission. Of course we can learn much from the past, but we must not be blindly tied to it. We must try to understand the motto of Oxford University: "Dominus illuminatio mea." Then we shall be helped by the experience and wisdom of the good men who have gone before us, but we shall not be held down by the hand of a dead past.'

These extracts shall end with a short cutting from the letter of an elder in the Free Kirk :—

'The day was not necessarily a burden to the young, but there were cases where mistaken strictness prevailed. When I was a boy our next door neighbours pulled down the blinds and refrained from lighting the hall lamp. . . . If the former state of things in Scotland meant only Pharisaism, hypocrisy, and narrow

Puritanism, we are well rid of it. But we know it meant more than that and produced qualities which have made the race.'[1]

V

The letters here quoted may, and to many undoubtedly will seem discouraging. It is possible, of course, that the writers are a little too near their facts to get their perspective right. Those who know what it is to feel keenly about such subjects will understand this. That there is cause for anxiety cannot be denied, for the neglect of Sunday is widespread and affects all classes of society; but lamentations are seldom of much use, and the best plan is quietly to consider whether, after all, matters are quite as bad as they look, and whether this neglect may not be largely due to changed conditions of life.

To begin with, much of the carelessness which we lament is the outcome of modern developments of social life. The pressure of work and of long hours is much greater, and facilities for locomotion have enormously increased. Moreover this is an age of unsettlement; all old beliefs and practices are questioned; nothing is taken for granted; everything that involves restraint meets with rebellion. Under such circumstances it cannot be expected that the observance of Sunday, which is so intimately bound up

[1] See also Appendix I.

with the essence of religion, and which cannot be anything more than a form when there is no true love of God, should gain more from the world than a polite and distant recognition. If this recognition is withheld, or grudgingly accorded, perhaps it is well, for a conformity which is no more than formal is worth little. A natural reaction also accounts for much. In the middle of the nineteenth century there were many families in which children were not taught to love or look forward to Sunday. The week-day lesson was escaped, but to many children that did not mean rest. They had to learn the collect for the day, which was no light task. The Sunday reading was often of the dullest; happy were those who were allowed to read such books as *Historical Tales*, or Bishop Wilberforce's allegories. For village children there was Sunday school twice in the day, too often with a teacher who 'came to the end of all he knew' long before the end of the regulation time. The Services were long and dull, wholly above the comprehension of the young, for whom special provision was seldom made, and who were not taught to understand or enter into them. Reverence, moreover, in a high pew was never easy. The hours of Sunday which were not spent in church were in many households difficult to kill. The comfortless meals, the dull games, the conscientious effort to read wearisome books, the almost inevitable tendency to indulge in acts of surreptitious mischief were demoralising. On the mind of many a man now in middle life is

stamped an impression which perhaps can never be quite obliterated.

Reaction then may account for much, but there is yet a further cause. There has been of late years a marked loosening of family ties and customs, a loosening which is the inevitable result of the keener struggle for existence, and the greatly increased facilities for recreation and locomotion.

Here again it is to be doubted whether such a loosening of ties, with their consequent obligations, was not in some ways needed. True, there is much in it that we lament; and so far as it means loss of self-control and the weakening of habits of obedience, it is definitely bad. But on the other hand these family ties, with their imperious demands, have often impeded individual development and have held many back, not only from the realisation of their vocation, but from the full use of the grace of God which might have been theirs. 'His divine power hath granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness'; but many a man and woman has been in the past held back from using these things by the exaggerated deference held to be due to the claims, often wholly unjustifiable, of home. Thus, it has been too often the case that a man's foes have been they of his own household.

We may hope that in the days which are coming, family ties, while not less precious than in the past, may cease to quench individuality, to promote low and vague views of the meaning and purpose of life,

to mask indolence and to obscure vocation. They may bring, as they ought, the union which is strength.

There is another consideration which may keep us from losing heart. Much of this secularising of Sunday, which looks like the casting aside of all religious restraint, is in reality only the casting off of decorous shams. To spend Sunday on the river, or in taking exercise, is more satisfactory than spending it in bed, or in idle aimless loafing, although the man who does not recognise the claim of God upon his life will never spend Sunday well. If he performs his duties towards God without real meaning or intention, he may give less offence to his neighbour, but it is an open question whether it is better for himself.

After all it amounts to this: the world recognises God up to a certain point. For the world God exists in the background as an ultimate court of appeal, as a possible help in trouble. God, the world also says, means well by us, acts as our Providence, gives us blessings which we fully deserve and take as our right, but we angrily and bitterly resent His dealings with us when they are not to our mind; and this attitude the best of our youth unconsciously rejects as failing to correspond with that which, if only in a dim way, represents to them the religious ideal. Nowadays we are seeing more clearly that the revival of religion means in its essence the accepting by thought and deed of the claim of God: in other words, it means obedience to the Cross of Christ. 'I determined,' says

S. Paul, 'not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.'[1] It was a stern message, 'unto Jews a stumbling block, and unto Gentiles foolishness,'[2] but it was one which would appeal by its very reality to all that was best and noblest in the world around. 'I am not ashamed of the Gospel; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first and also to the Greek.'[3]

Here is an ideal, a standard of life, which the best of those to whom we wish to appeal can respect, and which will attract men if it is put before them faithfully.

Ideals are the inspiration of life. The great masters of all arts and philosophies have set up high ideals, ideals demanding generosity and devotion on the part of their disciples. High ideals demanding self-sacrifice are what we want; for the age is a lax one. As Joubert says, 'We live in an age in which superfluous ideas abound, and essential ideas are lacking.' The popular conception of what the Christian life means is low; we have drifted into a state of contented respectability. Christ crucified has not been our pattern, or our inspiration; Christ in His risen life has not been our strength. If He had been, the best of our men could not be content to live such aimless lives, to go on year after year without Communion, or to die without the Food for the last journey. It is this miserable contentment with what is second-rate that is disheartening.

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 2. [2] 1 Cor. i. 23. [3] Rom. i. 16.

We have made the fatal error of trying to attract our young men and women by amusements, games, offers of intellectual improvement, or bright services—all very well in their way, and most necessary for their well-being, but not the things that really satisfy. A religion which has some grit and reality in it is what will win them. We cannot believe that the young people of England, so ready to fling themselves into a life of self-sacrifice in South Africa,[1] so keen in their acceptance of anything that really interests them physically or mentally, are incapable of religious enthusiasm. Probably it is more our fault than theirs if they have not been interested in their religion; it means that we have not given them the teaching which will draw them.

A religion which touches the *will*, which is not afraid to ask for self-sacrifice and self-denial, is the form of religion which will appeal to the best among them—it may, and doubtless will, repel some, but it will attract those whom we may reasonably hope to win.[2] We are apt to forget what were our Lord's own methods. There was in His teaching a beauty and attractiveness which no other has ever yet had, and men flocked to hear Him. Yet what pains He took to hold back unreal people, to sift out His hearers. How slow He was to 'trust himself unto them';[3] how uncompromising and direct were His words about

[1] These words were written in 1901, during the war.
[2] Cf. 1 S. John iv. 6; S. John vi. 65. [3] S. John ii. 24.

the most awful mysteries, and how entirely He refrained from any explanation which might have made things too easy.[1] How urgently He demanded that men should develop in the various stages of their spiritual growth the faculty of faith implanted in them.

It is well to remember what has been already implied, that those who have in them the power of responding to what is noble and beautiful have a first claim upon us. We cannot expect that the shallow, flippant, and irreverent will listen to what is highest; and there is danger lest by holding out what is lower and more superficially attractive we should merely attach to us such as these, and repel, by seeming unreality, the finer characters. There is something radically wrong in our teaching if we do not appeal to the highest types of character among those with whom we have to do.[2]

We must sorrowfully admit that to many thoughtful people modern religious teaching has to a great extent failed in its appeal. It cannot be said that the average service or sermon in most of our churches interests the more thoughtful of our young men and women. With a sort of patience they tolerate it, but it does not stir enthusiasm, or make them keen; it does not make religion the pivot of their life. What they want is teaching that shall be obviously real; they want the vision of our Lord; they want to 'see Jesus,' not as the Philanthropist, or the

[1] S. John vi. 60 ff. [2] Cf. 1 S. John iv. 6.

Teacher of wisdom, but as the Lord of heaven and earth. They are more ready than we imagine to recognise His claims and to give Him a whole-hearted service.

This failure may be due in part to our English character, with its timid reserve in speaking about deep things. Many good people, even if their own faith is deep and vital, are either shy of putting it before others, or afraid of seeming to set up too high an ideal; they are afraid of enthusiasm. As Bishop Westcott says: 'There is much of the spirit of the hireling among us . . . we hide ourselves, we make but little effort to penetrate the hearts of others.'[1]

Our duty is fearlessly to set out the claim of our Lord in such a way that it shall attract what is noblest and best in the world around us. It is foolish to expect that Sunday will have attractions for those to whom religion means nothing: it is impossible to suppose that Sunday will be neglected by those to whom religion is all in all.

Thank God there is a bright side to English religious life, and certainly there is no cause for despair. There are quiet country places where truer ideas of the obligations of church membership still prevail. There are churches in town and country where the faithful have learned what worship means, and flock to God's House with real and earnest devotion. There is an army of earnest men and women, often such as have little

[1] Westcott, *Revelation of the Father*, p. 87.

leisure on other days, who devote time and pains on Sunday to teaching children and others the great truths of the faith. These things must not be forgotten.

While we still lament the growth of restlessness, the prevalent dislike of restraint, the reaction from undue strictness, the loosening of family ties, yet the repudiation by the best of our young people of anything that seems to them unreal, ought, so far from discouraging us, to fill us with hope, as we set ourselves to bring about a better state of things. If it is true that underneath much seeming neglect there is in many a higher ideal, and a growth of vital religion, we cannot for a moment despair. Much that looks discouraging may be really a gain, and much of the rebellion against old-established ways may be but the breaking-down of a dead formality. Growth and development seldom come but through seeming trouble and loss.

SUNDAY ACTS

The principal statutes in force relating to Sunday observance are:

1 Car. I. c. 1 (1625).
3 Car. I. c. 2 (1627).
29 Car. II. c. 7 (1677).
21 Geo. III. c. 49 (1781).
The Bread Act (1836), 6 and 7 Will. IV. c. 37, sec. 14, with 3 Geo. IV. c. cvi, sec. 16.
The Sunday Observance Prosecution Act (1871), 34 and 35 Vict. c. 87.

The Acts of the Stuarts, as set forth in the preambles thereto,

were passed 'for the better observance and keeping holy the Lord's Day,' and the mischiefs at which they aimed included :— persons meeting out of their own parish for sports and pastimes whatsoever, and in their own parish for bear-baiting, bull-baiting, interludes, common plays, and other unlawful exercises; wagoners or drovers travelling with wagons and cattle respectively; and butchers killing or selling victual. The Statute 29 Car. II. c. 7 was declaratory of the existing law, and directed its careful execution. It commanded the lieges to exercise themselves in the 'duties of piety and true religion' in public and private; forbade tradesmen, artificers, and others, to pursue their ordinary calling on Sunday; penalised the public crying and exposing of merchandise, fruits or chattels whatsoever; and made void the service and execution of suit, process and warrant, save in cases of treason, felony, or breach of the peace.

The Sunday Observance Act (21 Geo. III. c. 49) imposes a fine of £200 on any one who opens for profit a place of public amusement on Sunday, and of £50 on those who advertise the same.

Prosecutions under the Act 29 Car. II. c. 7 can be instituted with the written sanction of a chief police officer of district, two justices of the peace, or a stipendiary magistrate. Such sanction is indispensable before information laid (34 and 35 Vict. c. 87).

Penalties imposed under the earlier statutes range from 3s. 4d. (for unlawful indulgence in pastimes) to fine and forfeiture (for publicly exposing and crying wares, etc.). They are recoverable by distress, and, in default, imprisonment. Frequently the poor of the parish in which the offence is committed are to be benefited thereby.

Penal acts such as the foregoing are construed strictly by the courts, and judicial findings have produced curious, though logical, results. For instance, a gardener may make bread on Sunday, but he may not dig, and *co converso* a baker may dig but not bake (save under certain restrictions imposed by 6 and 7 William IV. c. 37). A horsedealer may make a binding contract for the sale of a horse on Sunday, provided he complete the transaction on a week-day, and a shoemaker who repairs

boots on Sunday has a lien upon the boots repaired till his charges are paid.

The performance of ordinary domestic duties is provided for, and under this provision it has been held that a baker may bake dinners for his customers on Sunday. Milk may also be cried before 9 A.M., and after 4 P.M. The muffin-man and newsvendor seem to be within the scope of the Acts, as they would be doing that within their ordinary employment. Railway Companies and others *ejusdem generis* are probably protected by the possession of statutory powers.

The Licensing Laws provide for the closing of public-houses during certain hours on Sundays, and no restraint is put upon any one desiring to lay an information thereunder. The provinces are distinguished from the metropolis, and villages from towns.

Notes on the Practical Value of these Acts at the Present Day.

Mr. G. L. Denman, Metropolitan Police Magistrate, contributes the following notes:—

A.

'Speaking generally, the provisions of these Acts are still in force, although the changed condition of society has rendered some of them practically obsolete. No statute is repealed by merely becoming obsolete, but, as Lord Bacon remarks (Essay on Judicature), 'Penal laws, if they have been sleepers of long, or if they be grown unfit for the present time, should be by wise judges confined in the execution.' Thus the general tendency of judicial decisions has been to maintain the policy of the old acts with regard to restrictions upon unnecessary trading, but somewhat to relax their severity in so far as they limit harmless recreation, and the Sunday Observance Prosecution Act, 1871, above referred to, may be regarded as a statutory recognition of this principle.'

B.

'Among other statutes which affect incidentally the observance of Sunday, are the Game Act, 1831 (1 and 2 Will. IV. c. 32), which prohibits the killing or taking of game 'by any person whatsoever' on Sunday; and the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, which forbids the employment of women, young persons, and children in a factory or workshop on Sunday.

The Licensing Laws include billiard and bagatelle rooms, and pawnshops, in their closing provisions.

All the above Acts are strictly enforced.

The operation of the Sunday Observance Act, 1677, subject to local control, seems to vary with local necessity, and is further subject to special statutory exemptions,—in the case, for instance, of Herring Fisheries, Mackerel Catchers and Sellers; London Cab and Stage Carriage Traffic (1 and 2 Will. IV. c. 22, sec. 37), etc. The position of Sunday as 'a non-business day' (to use the term of the Act itself) is recognised by the Bills of Exchange Act, 1882. The practice of using this 'off-day' for holding vestry or corporation meetings, or meetings of public companies, and other meetings 'of a public and secular nature,' is repressed by 3 and 4 Will. IV. c. 31; but this Act does not apply to municipal corporations.

In further modification of the operation of the Act 21 Geo. III. c. 49, may be noted the Remission of Penalties Act, 1875, expressly empowering the Crown to remit in whole or in part any penalty, fine, or forfeiture imposed or recovered under the former Act.

Although the enforcement of the Act 21 Geo. III. c. 49 has been discouraged by technical obstacles in the Superior Courts, it must be remembered that the attempted enforcement has been in respect of entertainments rational and elevating in themselves, and very close to the borderline dividing secular and sacred. It does not follow that the Act would be found to be in any degree obsolete if any ordinary Music Hall, for instance, were to open with its usual week-day programme. It must not be forgotten also that by a recent statute the local authority has now the right of licensing such public entertainments,

subject to such restrictions as they may impose. This provision, of course, must supersede to some extent the necessity of having recourse to the Act 21 Geo. III. c. 49.

Various other sections scattered throughout the statutes, such as the power conferred on local authorities to suspend Sunday traffic, though incidental in their nature individually, yet operate together to help the Sunday observance.

As to the Acts of the Stuarts, as to people leaving their own parish in order to amuse themselves in another parish on Sunday, the evil aimed at is not one of those which vanish with the growth of civilised development and thought; but the parishes which certainly do resent the intrusion have other means in the more modern Local Government Acts of mitigating the evil to a large extent. A multitude of Sunday trippers may be met with an entire cessation of Sunday trade and stage traffic, and with stringent street and shore by-laws made by the local authorities at the places invaded.

The position of the Railway Companies is worth looking into. At all events, whether by statute or other regulation, the hours of public worship on Sunday are uniformly respected by the railways as far as possible.

The Bread Act is continually enforced by an Association of Master Bakers, who being themselves subject to the Act are anxious that no competitors of other religions shall snatch an unfair advantage over them, from any public reluctance to prosecute those whose Sabbath falls on another day of the week.'

CHAPTER V

PRINCIPLES OF SUNDAY OBSERVANCE

In the preceding chapters the history of the observance of the Lord's Day has been briefly sketched. It appears to have been interwoven with the life of the Christian Church from the first as a natural, we might almost say an inevitable, outcome of the joyful belief of the first disciples in the Risen Lord. In different ages, and even in the same age, varying theories of its origin and methods of observing it have prevailed. But the evidence brought forward has not been so consistent or so convincing as to leave no room for further enquiry. Its history has had a devious course, and it is difficult to deduce sufficient guidance for our own conduct. We must go back, therefore, behind history and examine the teaching of Him Who came 'to make all things new.' It would be in any case impossible to look upon the enquiry as complete without a careful consideration of our Lord's teaching on the subject.

I

It must first of all be noted that our Lord found Himself in the atmosphere of an elaborate system of written and traditional law,—a system which claimed the force, not only of long established prescription, but of divine authority. He was 'made under the Law —He buried Himself within the very heart of the actual situation as it stood.'[1]

But although by the circumstances of His human birth He took His place in the midst of it, He made it quite clear that He did not intend to continue it as it was. He constantly speaks of another kingdom, with new laws deriving their force from His own divine mission—His Church.

Nor does He leave us in doubt as to the relation of the old theocracy to the new kingdom—either as regards general laws, or particular points of detail. The general law of the new kingdom is set forth in the Sermon on the Mount.[2] There we learn that our Lord came not to destroy, not to sweep away the old, but recognising its divine purpose as preparatory, to fulfil it, to quicken and deepen it, to give life to the dry bones,[3] to put flesh upon them and breathe His Spirit into them that they might live, to turn, in fact, the old 'hedge of the Law' into a vital rule of Christian life.

[1] See H. S. Holland, *On Behalf of Belief*, pp. 187 ff.
[2] S. Matt. v-vii. [3] Ezek. xxxvii. 5.

As regards the particular question of the Sabbath, the teaching of our Lord is specially clear. It is difficult to see how it could have been otherwise, if His principles were to be understood by those to whom He spoke. Owing to the exaggerated and minute regulations with which the Sabbath had been surrounded by the rabbis, it was necessary, as we can see, that He should deal with the question in the most unhesitating and decisive manner.

'Its really important and reasonable restrictions were buried under a host of regulations of the pettiest description.' The burden of those regulations it is almost impossible for us to conceive. Take the following as one instance out of many:—

'The prohibition to tie or untie a knot was too general, so it became necessary to define the species of knots referred to. It was accordingly laid down that a camel-driver's knot and a boatman's knot rendered the man who tied or untied them guilty; but R. Meir said, "a knot which a man can untie with one hand only, he does not become guilty by untying." A woman might, however, tie on various articles of dress, and also tie up skins of wine, and pots of meat. A pail might be tied to a well by a band (fascia), but not by a rope. R. Jehudah laid down the rule that any knot might be lawfully tied which was not intended to be permanent.'[1]

[1] Dr. Driver, in Hastings's *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. iv. s.v. *Sabbath*.

Six separate occasions are recorded by the Evangelists on which our Lord came into direct conflict with Jewish prejudices in regard to these Sabbath regulations, and recalled His hearers to the underlying revealed truth which they obscured.

The first occasion was when His disciples plucked the ears of corn on the Sabbath :—

'It came to pass, that he was going on the sabbath day through the cornfields; and his disciples began, as they went, to pluck the ears of corn. And the Pharisees said unto him, Behold, why do they on the sabbath day that which is not lawful? And he said unto them, Did ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was an hungred, he, and they that were with him? How he entered into the house of God when Abiathar was high priest, and did eat the shew-bread, which it is not lawful to eat save for the priests, and gave also to them that were with him? And he said unto them, The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath: so that the Son of Man is Lord even of the sabbath.'[1]

Some words of Dr. Driver, in which he shows the application of this teaching of our Lord, may be quoted here :—

'On its practical side it was essentially an institution "made for man." Its intention was to give a rest from laborious and engrossing occupations, and from the cares and anxieties of daily life, and at the same

[1] S. Mark ii. 23-28. Cf. S. Matt. xii. 1-8; S. Luke vi. 1-5.

time to secure leisure for thoughts of God. The restrictions attached to it were meant to be interpreted in the spirit, not in the letter. It had not essentially an austere or rigorous character; it was never intended that actions demanded by duty, necessity, or benevolence should be proscribed on it. Its aim was rather to counteract the deadening influence, upon both body and soul, of never interrupted daily toil, and of continuous absorption in secular pursuits.'[1]

The second occasion arose from our Lord healing the man with the withered hand:—

'He departed thence, and went into their synagogue: and behold, a man having a withered hand. And they asked him, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath day? that they might accuse him. And he said unto them, What man shall there be of you, that shall have one sheep, and if this fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much then is a man of more value than a sheep. Wherefore it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath day.'[2]

The third occasion was in connection with the miracle wrought upon the woman with a spirit of infirmity:—

'And he was teaching in one of the synagogues on the sabbath day. And behold, a woman which had a

[1] Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iv. s.v. *Sabbath*.
[2] S. Matt. xii. 9-12; cf. S. Luke vi. 6-9; S. Mark iii. 1-4.

spirit of infirmity eighteen years; and she was bowed together, and could in no wise lift herself up. And when Jesus saw her, he called her, and said unto her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity. And he laid his hands upon her: and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. And the ruler of the synagogue, being moved with indignation because Jesus had healed on the sabbath, answered and said to the multitude, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the day of the sabbath. But the Lord answered him and said, Ye hypocrites, doth not each one of you on the sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan had bound, lo, these eighteen years, to have been loosed from this bond on the day of the sabbath?'[1]

The circumstance of His curing the man with the dropsy supplied the fourth occasion:—

'It came to pass, when he went into the house of one of the rulers of the Pharisees on a sabbath to eat bread, that they were watching him. And behold, there was before him a certain man which had the dropsy. And Jesus answering spake unto the lawyers and Pharisees, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath, or not? But they held their peace. And he took him, and healed him, and let him go. And he said unto them, Which of you shall have an ass or

[1] S. Luke xiii. 10-16.

an ox fallen into a well, and will not straightway draw him up on a sabbath day? And they could not answer again unto these things.'[1]

The fifth occasion arose as a sequel to His healing, at the Pool of Bethesda, a man who had been ill for thirty-eight years:—

'A certain man was there, which had been thirty and eight years in his infirmity. When Jesus saw him lying, and knew that he had been now a long time in that case, he said unto him, Wouldest thou be made whole? The sick man answered him, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool: but while I am coming, another steppeth down before me. Jesus saith unto him, Arise, take up thy bed, and walk. And straightway the man was made whole, and took up his bed and walked. Now it was the sabbath on that day. So the Jews said unto him that was cured, It is the sabbath, and it is not lawful for thee to take up thy bed. But he answered them, He that made me whole, the same said unto me, Take up thy bed, and walk. They asked him, Who is the man that said unto thee, Take up thy bed, and walk? But he that was healed wist not who it was: for Jesus had conveyed himself away, a multitude being in that place. Afterward Jesus findeth him in the temple, and said unto him, Behold, thou art made whole: sin no more, lest a worst thing befall thee. The man went away, and told the Jews

[1] S. Luke xiv. 1-6.

that it was Jesus which had made him whole. And for this cause did the Jews persecute Jesus, because he did these things on the sabbath. But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh even until now, and I work. For this cause therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only brake the sabbath, but also called God his own Father, making himself equal with God.'[1]

The sixth occasion was after His miracle of restoring sight to a blind man by anointing his eyes with clay :—

'Now it was the sabbath on the day when Jesus made the clay, and opened his eyes. Again therefore the Pharisees also asked him how he received his sight. And he said unto them, He put clay upon mine eyes, and I washed, and do see. Some therefore of the Pharisees said, This man is not from God, because he keepeth not the sabbath. But others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such signs? And there was a division amongst them.'[2]

From these passages we can gather four leading principles of our Lord's teaching about the Sabbath.

(*a*) He claims absolute authority with regard to it. 'The Son of man is lord even of the sabbath'[3] 'The Sabbath, being made for man's benefit, is administered and controlled by man's Head and Representative.'[4]

(*b*) He demands ethical, not ceremonial obedience.

[1] S. John v. 5-18.
[2] S. John ix. 14-16.
[3] S. Mark ii. 28.
[4] Swete, *Commentary on S. Mark, l.c.*

'If ye had known what this meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.'[1]

(*c*) The Sabbath is relative to man's need. 'The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath.'[2]

(*d*) The eternal energy of God forbids us to interpret rest as equivalent to idleness. 'My Father worketh even until now, and I work.'[3] 'That is to say, the rest of God after the Creation, which the Sabbath represents outwardly, and which I come to realise, is not a state of inaction, but of activity, and man's true rest is not a rest *from* earthly labour, but a rest *for* divine heavenly labour.'[4]

II

But we have not yet reached the root of the matter. Our Lord has been dealing, in the passages we have considered, with the Jewish Sabbath; we want to know what He teaches about the Christian Lord's Day. Our reading of Church history has shown us that the two institutions are not identical, and that the attempt directly to base the observance of Sunday on the Fourth Commandment has always led to disastrous results.[5] We cannot, therefore, take the

[1] S. Matt. xii. 7. [2] S. Mark ii. 27. [3] S. John v. 17.
[4] Westcott, *Commentary on S. John*, *l.c.*
[5] 'The true view appears to be that the Sunday is not *substituted for* the Jewish Sabbath; the Sabbath is abolished: and the observance of

passages already considered as giving us any direct teaching about our immediate subject. We must look at the teaching of our Lord again, with a different aim and with a wider outlook.

Nothing is shown more clearly by a careful study of the Gospels than the fact that the purpose of our Lord's teaching is neither to restate religious obligations, nor to emphasise any outward observance, but something deeper and more vital, namely, to quicken and direct the springs of inner life and character. 'I came,' He said, 'that they may have life.'[2]

Let not any one suppose that this involves the abolition of outward rules. Human nature being what it is, rules are needed for moulding and guiding the character, and shaping the life. That our Lord does will to regulate our lives, that such regulation is involved in the very idea of following Him, is sufficiently evident to a reader of the Gospels: the change in the nature of the regulation is the necessary outcome of the change in the underlying principle.

We shall find as we study the Gospels three main principles.

1. In the first place Jesus is Himself the centre of

the first day of the week is an *analogous* institution, based on the consecration of that day by our Lord's Resurrection, sanctioned by Apostolic usage (Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2), and accepted by the Early Church . . . in a manner consonant with the higher and more spiritual teaching of Christ, and to be observed in the spirit of loyal Christian freedom, rather than by obedience to a system of precise statutes.'—Dr. Driver, in Hastings's *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. iv. s.v. *Sabbath.*

[2] S. John x. 10.

His own teaching, the object to which He continually points His followers. 'Come unto Me' is His cry; it is this that, more than anything else, makes His position as a religious teacher unique. No other has ever made such a claim, or held up himself as the beginning and ending of his teaching. 'He preaches above all and in all Himself; all radiates from Himself; all converges towards Himself.' Our Lord's recorded teaching is penetrated by His self-assertion. In His dealing with separate individuals His claims are unbounded. 'He commands, He does not invite discipleship.' He says 'Follow Me.' No rival claim, however strong, no natural affection, however legitimate and sacred, may be interposed between Himself and His follower. 'He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of me.' He speaks of Himself as the 'Light of the World,' the 'Bread of Life,' the one 'Good Shepherd,' the 'Door of the Sheepfold,' the 'Vine.' He, and He alone, is the way to the Father. 'No man cometh unto the Father but by Me.'[1]

Now this claim puts His teaching on a different footing from that of any other 'Prophet.' He does not merely state abstract truths, or urge moral considerations, He makes a demand which He, and He only, has a right to make. He asks whole-hearted love and surrender: 'Lovest thou Me?' is His question; the basis of discipleship is obedience and personal surrender to His claim. So we find S. Paul

[1] Cf. Liddon, *B.L.* v. *passim.*

calling himself 'a servant of Jesus Christ'; his desire is that he 'may know him and the power of his resurrection.' The life of the Church too is centred in Him; Christians are 'in Christ,' and Christ in them, they 'abide' in Christ and Christ in them.

2. Our Lord's method of dealing with men is in harmony with this. He does not attempt to change the world by outward force, social organisation, or the assertion of general principles, but by the regeneration and progressive sanctification of human souls, individually and socially communicating vitality to them.[1] It is by the contagion of personality, and by the transmission of character that He works. His own life is consecrated for others' sakes;[2] others will become fruitful by the surrender of their lives to Him,[3] and to the working of His grace.

'Secular systems work from without inwards. The mission of the Church is to work outward from within. Secular systems deal with men in masses. The mission of the Church is to individual souls. Secular systems attack crime against society. The mission of the Church is to cure sin, the root of crime.

'Secondary agencies may remove temptation, and limit the range of evil, by controlling its outward exhibition; but all this will not regenerate the world, unless the recesses of the soul be reached; and that,

[1] Peabody, *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*, ch. ii. p. 89.
[2] Cf. S. John xvii. 19. [3] Cf. S. John xii. 24, 25.

and that alone, is the province of the Church of Christ.'[1]

3. The purpose of our Lord's earthly ministry is the foundation of the Kingdom of God. From the beginning to the end of it the kingdom is in view. The first recorded words of His preaching, as of His Forerunner's, are 'the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' In one parable after another He develops various aspects of the kingdom, revealing what it is and is to be.[2] In the very midst of His Passion He claims to be a king: 'Thou sayest that I am a king.' 'My kingdom is not of this world.'

The kingdom moreover is a living thing, under the continual and ever-present rule of the King. 'Lo, I am with you alway,' He says, 'even unto the end of the world.' In the kingdom He Himself is ever working, teaching, governing, uplifting lives by the mysterious power of His Holy Spirit, 'the Spirit of Christ.'

III

Having regard to these things, we are not surprised to find that there is no express statement of our Lord having laid down detailed regulations with His own lips as to the observance of the Lord's Day, or of His having uttered any Christian Fourth Commandment. The observance of a day of worship and rest

[1] Illingworth, *University and Cathedral Sermons*, pp. 219, 220.
[2] S. Matt. xiii. *passim*.

might have been of little moral value had it been laid upon the Church as an external obligation, instead of being the outgrowth of a living character, the utterance and expression of Christian joy. Men observed the first day of the week spontaneously and naturally as the expression of the new life which they felt within them, and it took its place amongst the institutions of Christendom. We find therefore in the observance of the day the result of the principles which we have been considering.

Sunday will be observed by those who are the true children of the kingdom, not only as an act of obedience to the laws of the kingdom, but as a reasonable act of personal devotion to their King. True, the kingdom has its laws, and in this particular matter has continually legislated as to the way in which the day shall be observed; for laws and regulations are inevitable. But the obedience of the true children of the kingdom will be no mere obedience to the laws, but primarily an act of loyalty to the King. The new life of the Christian will inevitably mount upward to Him. 'If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is seated on the right hand of God.'[1]

We find S. Peter exhorting his converts to 'show forth the excellencies of him who called' them 'out of darkness into his marvellous light.'[2] For the Christian must thus respond to the claim of God in

[1] Col. iii. 1. [2] 1 S. Pet. ii. 9.

Christ; the recognition of the claim will be the first instinct of the man to whom the new life is a reality. He cannot hold back from God, the ever Blessed Trinity, that homage and devotion which is His due; he cannot but desire to deepen his union with the Father through Him Who is 'the way, the truth, and the life,'[1] through Whom alone such union is possible. But this is a claim which inevitably demands the setting apart of a portion of his time. Living as he does in a world distractingly full of outward things, which make ceaseless calls upon his time and energies, he is morally certain to ignore God's claim if some definite part of his time is not consecrated to His service. It is just this consecration of a portion of time to God which makes the reading of the Fourth Commandment in the Holy Communion service no empty unreality. Under the old dispensation the seventh day was 'set apart,' it was consecrated to God, just as the nation itself was, or the sacred tribe of Levi, the priestly family of Aaron, and the individual High Priest from that family. This principle of consecration ran through the Jewish Law. A sacred building, the Temple, was set apart, and further within that the 'inner court,' and again within this inner court the 'Holy of Holies.' The firstfruits of the harvest, the firstlings of the cattle were also set apart—in Dr. Dale's words—'consecrated men, consecrated property, consecrated space, consecrated time

[1] S. John xiv. 6.

declared that God still claimed the world as His own, and that in all the provinces of life He insisted on being recognised as Lord of all.'[1]

IV

It will be well at this point to state the conclusions to which the principles detailed above seem to lead us: in the chapters which follow they are more fully developed.

1. The life of the Christian will express itself Godward in the form of worship. This will of necessity involve the consecration of a definite portion of his time.

2. Sunday will be a day of rest, for the purpose of individual development. Our Lord sanctified Himself for us; He would sanctify individual lives for the world. The new life therefore must be allowed to grow. But spiritual growth goes on in quiet—'Your life is hid with Christ in God.' 'The word' is easily 'choked,' easily 'becometh unfruitful'; the Christian soon may lose his consciousness of union with Christ. Sunday therefore will not only be the overflowing expression of love to God, but an opportunity for the deepening of character. Without this a man will never learn, as he ought, to say with the Apostle 'to me to live is Christ'; 'I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me.'

[1] Dale, *Ten Commandments*, pp. 95, 96.

3. It will be a day for promoting the interests of the kingdom of God and of service for others. Our Lord works in and through the individual, but always treats the individual as an integral part of the Body —the Church, of which he is made a member—as one in vital relation to the whole Body and to each member of it, and in consequence responsible for doing his share in promoting its growth.

The individual and the kingdom are to grow together: 'the kingdom an unfolding process of social righteousness to be worked out through individuals; the individual prompted to his better life by the thought of bringing in the kingdom.'[1] Thus the advancement of the kingdom of God must be near to the heart of all its true children, of all who pray 'Thy kingdom come.'

Nor is it only in what we may call the direct advancement of the kingdom that such service is to be rendered: any unselfish use of the day must be in accordance with the mind of Him Who said 'ought not this woman . . . whom Satan had bound . . . to have been loosed from this bond on the day of the Sabbath?'[2] A selfish use of the day would not be a Christian use; a narrow, individual religion cannot be the religion of Jesus Christ. 'By this,' He said, 'shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.'[3]

[1] Peabody, *ut supr.* p. 102.
[2] S. Luke xiii. 16.
[3] S. John xiii. 35.

This idea was foreshadowed clearly enough in the Sabbath regulation: 'So far as we can trace the Sabbath back among the Hebrews it was a day sacred to Jehovah, and also a day . . . marked by cessation from labour in the house and in the field: it had thus essentially a philanthropic character, the duty enjoined on it, as Wellhausen has said, being less that the Israelite should rest himself than that he should give others rest.'[1]

The manner in which the Lord's people keep the Lord's Day must illustrate this principle. There must be no selfish isolation, no narrowing down of sympathies. As members of a Body, Christians will recognise[2] the necessity of corporate worship, the appointed means by which the Body makes its voice heard before God. Finally, the quiet and rest which the day affords will be utilised in making other people's lives better, or at least happier.[3]

It will scarcely be denied that a Sunday such as this, a day for looking upward, inward, and outward, a day for fulfilling our obligations to God, ourselves, and our neighbour, would be a thing of reality and power. In its outward form it would express the root principles of the new life; and the more vigorous

[1] Dr. Driver, Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iv. p. 321, s.v. 'Jesus Christ.'

[2] See p. 23, and cf. 1 Cor. xii. *passim.*

[3] Appendix A, pp. 268, 270. For the recognition of this claim in Christian history, see some interesting references to laws ordering visits to prisons to be made on Sunday, in Smith and Cheetham's *Dict. of Christian Antiq.*, Art. 'Lord's Day,' p. 1047. (1880.)

the life, the more obvious will be its manifestation. Where the life is real, Sunday will be real; where the life is unreal, Sunday will either not be observed at all, or if observed it will have sunk to the level of a mere ordinance, an external obligation, retained only from old use and custom, having no inner meaning of its own.

In brief, recognising the personal claim of Christ, we must find time for worship; in view of the need of our own individual development we must rest; the furtherance of the kingdom of God being a necessary part of every Christian life, we must in some way make opportunities for service. Worship, rest, and service must find their place in every life. The main purpose of the chapters which follow is to show that to this end the observance of the Lord's Day is essential.

NOTE

The preceding pages of this chapter have been an attempt to indicate what may be called the philosophy of Sunday observance; to show how (like every other part of Christian life) it stands in an essential relation to the Incarnate Christ. It may be well to close this portion of the enquiry by briefly summarising the reasons which make the keeping of Sunday, and indeed certain methods of keeping it, a clear Christian duty.

1. The Ten Commandments contain the moral law for man; not only for the Jewish nation, but for all men to the end of time; their obligation is universal and permanent. They are part of the Divine treasure which Israel was elected to hold in trust for humanity. Of these, the particular lesson of the Fourth Commandment is that our time belongs to God, and its

particular obligation is the duty of the special dedication of a part of our time to God. The principle, then, is permanent.[1]

2. The Mosaic Law gave particular effect to this principle for the Jews by (*a*) appointing the Sabbath Day; (*b*) laying down the manner of its observance. These regulations were temporary; they were a particular application of a permanent obligation.

3. When the Christian Church faced this abiding obligation, it was no longer bound by the special requirements of Judaism, but made its own regulations:—

(*a*) It made Sunday the holy, consecrated day.

(*b*) In spite of all variations at different times, and in different places, it may justly be said that the whole Church is committed to the following obligations binding on Christians as Christian law:—

(i) To attend worship themselves and to see that others have opportunity to do the same.

(ii) To avoid unnecessary work themselves.

(iii) To protect others from unnecessary work.

[1] See Appendix C.

CHAPTER VI

WORSHIP

We have seen in the previous chapter that in dealing with the question which we have in hand, we must necessarily go back to fundamental principles, that since the whole relationship of God to man, and of man to God is involved, we cannot be content with looking at the matter merely in its historical aspect, or from the point of view of physical and mental development.

I

The most natural expression of a vigorous Christian life will be found in worship; the true Christian will inevitably 'show forth the excellencies of him who hath called him into his marvellous light.'[1]

It is easy to ignore this relationship of God to man; but life goes fatally wrong if we do so. 'Thou hast made us for Thyself,'[2] said S. Augustine; and he was but expressing a truth which underlies Old and New Testament alike.

[1] 1 S. Peter ii. 9. [2] *Confessions*, ch. i.; Migne, tom. iv. col. 661.

God is the Eternal I AM, all-sufficient, needing nothing; yet, in His infinite love He vouchsafes to call into being rational creatures, capable of knowing Him, of responding to His love, of giving Him their wills.

The Old Testament is the record of the yearning of Almighty God over His children: 'God rising up early and sending'; God devising means to bring His banished home. Israel is God's son; Israel is God's bride; for Israel to forget God is adultery. God cries to Israel, 'O my people, what have I done unto thee? and wherein have I wearied thee? testify against me.'[1]

To the Christian this yearning love of God comes with an even stronger appeal than to the Jew, for he has before him its fullest revelation in the Incarnation:—'God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son'; God 'spared not his own Son.' It is spoken of by our Blessed Lord again and again: under the figure of the shepherd seeking the lost sheep, the patient search of the woman for the lost coin, the eager response of the Father to the returning prodigal. It is taught in His words to rebellious Jerusalem: 'How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!'[2]

The Apostles drive the idea home: 'Ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price: glorify God therefore in your body.'[3] It is a commonplace

[1] Mic. vi. 3. [2] S. Matt. xxiii. 37. [3] 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20.

of the New Testament that as Israel of old was in a special sense God's people, so is the Church now. Such should be Christian teaching—that God's claim upon His creatures is absolute, and that the claim, so far as man is concerned, cannot be satisfied without worship.[1]

But there is the converse truth of the relationship of man to God. When S. Augustine says, 'Thou hast made us for Thyself,' he also says, 'the heart knoweth no rest till it finds rest in Thee.'

The heart of the wise man desires fulness of life—a balanced and healthy activity of every faculty directed towards its true end. Yet many miss it, are stunted, atrophied, or abnormally developed in one department of their nature at the expense of the rest. There is the athlete who has never given his brain a chance; the intellectual man whose brain is developed at the expense of his physical powers and health; the man who has developed every other power, physical and intellectual, but has wholly forgotten that he is a spiritual being, who in his devotion to reason forgets that his capacity of 'seeing him who is invisible,' and of knowing the things of God, is the highest development of reason itself, enlightened by the Holy Spirit of God. No amount of intellectual or physical development, however excellent and good in themselves, can ever of themselves lead to fulness of life, or end in anything but disappointment.

[1] S. John iv. 23.

It is mainly forgetfulness of this fact that causes the strange unrest which we find in so many lives to-day. 'Who will show us any good?' is no less common a cry, though it may be worded differently, than it was in the days of the Psalmist. In one form or another the question is reiterated, 'Is life worth living?' And there can be but one answer if no account is taken of the highest, the spiritual element of life.

Man is created in God's image; we must bring ourselves back to this fact again and again—the old fundamental truth that we learnt, and, may be, failed to grasp, when we were children.

This truth is needed for the solution of the riddle of life; the forgetfulness of it accounts for the unrest which is so prevalent; the remembrance of it throws light upon the fact that man, however much he may endeavour to hide the fact from himself, is a being full of cravings which nothing in this world can satisfy.

Treat man as anything else but a spiritual being, made for God, 'made in His image to witness Him,' and your analysis must fail. It is strange indeed that any man should wish to deny the fact of his spiritual nature, for it is this which constitutes his true dignity. All physical gifts are relatively transient, man's true greatness lies in his relation to God, in the fact of his divine kinship, and the infinite possibilities therein contained.

'Man became a living soul'—a soul, not a body.

The body does not condition the soul, but the soul the body. Man possesses a body indeed; but it is the soul, not the body, which makes him to be what he is. Whatever his physical antecedents may have been, of the origin of his soul at least there can be no question in the mind of a Christian, viz., that it came to him from the hand of God—as a special gift—and that it, rather than his body, constitutes him 'man.' To classify man with the animal world because of his body would be as great a mistake as to classify him with the angelic world because of his spiritual nature. So Plato says that man is 'a soul invested with a body,' and S. Augustine that he is a 'rational soul using an earthly and mortal body.'[1]

It has ever been the belief of the Catholic Church that after his creation man was endowed with a further gift, made 'partaker of the divine nature,' by an inbreathing of the Holy Spirit of God. God, Who knew whereof man was made, could not have left him without infusing into him light and power to enable him to walk in the right way. In effect, man was 'clothed with righteousness,' indwelt by the Holy Spirit, Who acted as 'the bridle of his lust.' It was in the strength of that Holy Spirit that he was to attain to the 'likeness' of God. 'Let us make man,' God said, '*in* our image, *after* our likeness.' As created in the image of God, 'that image calls upon our will and desires to seek His likeness; yet

[1] Quoted by Ullathorne, *Endowments of Man*, p. 11.

unless God gives us the power, we can never ascend to His likeness by our own strength. He makes us to be like Him by giving us the power to become like Him. But He has left to us the task of developing in ourselves that likeness.'[1] It is with the Christian now, as it was with Adam of old, in whom bodily creation was succeeded by the infusion of the life of grace. To the Christian now God has 'added all things that pertain unto life and godliness';[2] he is lifted up into the supernatural life of grace; over and above the many wonderful gifts which he possesses as man—gifts of memory, intellect, will, he is 'endued with heavenly virtues'; his whole being is changed, he is a 'new creature,' and, in a manner, so far as that is possible for man, he is made divine. In Adam the Holy Spirit came to dwell in an unfallen nature, to guide an undamaged will; in us He comes (for through the Incarnation of our Lord this has been made possible) to right what is wrong, to bring back a fallen nature into the path of holiness.[3]

Man is made for God.

> 'Made because that Love had need
> Of something irreversibly
> Pledged solely its content to be.'[4]

A house is a worthless thing if there is no one to inhabit it, a book if there is no one to read it, a

[1] Cf. 1 S. John iii. 3: ἁγνίζει. [2] 2 S. Pet. i. 3.
[3] Cf. Ullathorne, *Endowments of Man*, lect. i. ii.
[4] Robert Browning, *Johannes Agricola in Meditation.*

picture if no eye will see it; so man is inexplicable if God is not the ultimate end of all his inborn, rudimentary instincts.

Those who have gone through the necessary experience know that it is when a man finds God that 'the fret and aimless stir' goes out of life, that then peace and quiet come. 'Join thyself to eternity,' says S. Augustine, 'and thou shalt find rest.'[1] The more we submit to the unchangeable truth, which is the will of God, the more we share in the changelessness of Him who is *semper agens, semper quietus*, the more our spirits are united with eternal things, 'the more we reflect the unchangeable peace of eternity, and the less subject we are to the fretful things of time.'

In brief: 'When a man adheres to God he is something, when he departs from God he is nothing.'[2] Without that which is the end of his existence he is a failure. 'Man being in honour hath no understanding: but is compared unto the beasts that perish.'[3]

We may illustrate this in a very simple way. As a rule it is true that bad men hate solitude, that really devout men love it. The devout man, to whom God is everything, who knows that in God 'he lives and moves and has his being,' is never so little alone as when he is alone; it is then that his spirit can rise, unimpeded by outward companionship, to the one Being who is his very life. But the bad

[1] Quoted by Ullathorne, *ut supr.* p. 392.
[2] S. Aug. in Ps. lxxv. § 8.
[3] 1 Ps. xlix. 20.

man is miserable when alone. His heart cannot feed upon itself—it was never meant to do so. Therefore solitary confinement has driven many a man mad.

'Thou hast made us for Thyself, and the heart knoweth no rest till it find rest in Thee'—these words sum the matter up: they throw a flood of light on human life, its puzzles and mysteries, its joys and sorrows. For if what has been affirmed is true, many things otherwise inexplicable fall into place. The baffling mystery of evil, the sorrows which we can neither comfort nor explain away, the lives which seem valuable yet are snatched away so soon, those which seem worthless allowed to linger on and apparently to cumber the ground; even if all these do not find an actual explanation, yet at least we can discern the infinite love and wisdom which lies behind them all, if we steadily keep before us the fact of the end, remembering that 'all things work together for good'—remembering the one 'far-off divine event' to which all creation moves.[1]

II

There is much in the present condition of religion in England to sadden the hearts of those who long to see the mass of the English people drawn to God. The great majority of the poor, when they come to live in a town, lapse into indifference, and give up the

[1] See note in Dr. Westcott's *Commentary on the Epistles to the Hebrews*, chap. i. ver. 3, on the words, 'Upholding all things by the word of His power.'

habits of worship to which they have been accustomed from childhood; and many of the rich who go to church in the country never think of doing so in town. These facts seem to imply that true principles of worship have little real hold on the rich or poor in our land; they appear to be an evidence that men have forgotten the love of God and the response due to Him. If there were any real sense of duty or obligation in the matter, men when they come into a town would discover the nearest church as easily as they do the nearest public house, or the most convenient club. The facts seems to imply that the habit of public worship, which certainly did prevail more in the last generation than in this, must have been largely a 'fear towards God . . . taught by the precepts of men,' rather than obedience to a primary law of God. Had men then realised the absolute duty of devoting a portion of time to the worship of Almighty God, and done it as a duty which they loved, things could never have come to the present pass. There is too much reason for fearing that church-going has been in great part a following of fashion; that, for instance, the custom of the rich attending church in the country has been because there it is 'the thing,' because 'every one does it and one can't be peculiar,' because absence will be noticed, or, it may be, because in the quieter and less urgent life old associations have more force, and a man does not care to give up what he has done ever

since as a child he knelt by his mother's side in church.

In saying this it is not intended to imply that the average Englishman is godless, but that true ideas of what worship means have lost their hold on him.

The Englishman of the ordinary type is by no means godless; indeed few things are more remarkable than the place which religion of a vague kind has in his life, although it has so little hold upon his understanding. He resents the idea that he does not care about it; he says his prayers, he reads his Bible at home. We know how much latent religious feeling comes to the surface at any time of great national joy or sorrow. Indeed one sees it everywhere. No one who goes, for instance, to church on a Sunday morning, in any holiday resort, can imagine that religion has lost its hold. This shows us what hopeful material there is at hand to work upon, and how much more might be done if only people were more fully taught.

Indifference and ignorance account for an immense proportion of the apparent irreligion that exists. 'My people perish for lack of knowledge.' If people had been more carefully taught the principles of worship when they were children, they would, generally speaking, hold to them all their lives. Many of our people, religious at heart, religious in the depth of their being, religious in the shy reserved manner of the English, are neglecting to give to Almighty God 'the honour due unto his name,' withholding from

Him that by which He might be glorified, and thereby also stunting and weakening their own lives, failing to let in the sunlight that would gladden them if worship were to them what it might be. Contrast with this picture the masses of country folk who may be seen in some far-off Swiss or Tyrolese valley, turning out in the early morning, filling the churches to the doors; even, on a great festival, overflowing into the streets, in their simple and beautiful devotion. It is easy to sneer at such worship as superstition—may be it is a kind of superstition that is more pleasing to God than the cold indifference of which we see so much in our own land.

It may be said that the clergy are to blame for the existing state of things in England; but how far the responsibility rests on them it would be rash to attempt to say. It is true that many of them were brought up to go to church with nothing but the dimmest notion of why they should go, or what worship means; and even when the time of preparation for the ministry came some of them received but scanty enlightenment. They were set to lead the devotions of their people, to represent them at the altar, but had little realisation of what they were doing. So it is perhaps not much to be wondered at if sometimes the clergy have failed to teach adequately the meaning of worship, or to set forth its high ideal.

But there is another reason which explains much.

The spirit of the age is out of harmony with the highest ideas of worship. It is an unwelcome task to criticise any well-meant efforts to win the masses of our population; but there must be serious danger in the modern tendency to degrade the services of the Church to the level of a variety entertainment. Some years back there was a clever skit in the *Monthly Packet* in which the vicar of a parish and his organist were represented as discussing what they should do next with a view to attracting and interesting the people. They had tried everything, including five-minute services and organ recitals of the most alluring kind. At last in despair the curate suggests 'Let us try a little religion.' That is a hint that some of us might take now. In our anxiety to attract and interest, we have forgotten that at heart those we are trying to win are spiritual beings, that a 'holiday Sunday' will never last, that no amount of music, or lectures on social subjects, or 'Pleasant Sunday Afternoons' will satisfy the cravings of their immortal souls; that although they may not be able to express it, men want something deeper and better, and do not respect us for angling with such bait as this, and moreover that, even if they come to such services, their lives are not really touched. We may go deeper, and say that such unspiritual methods are wholly contrary to the methods of our Divine Lord and Master. In His earthly ministry His object throughout seems to have been, not to attract the

crowds, although indeed He often did, and at times may have wished to do so, but to make the few thorough.[1] His work was thoroughly to win the few, and so to lay a sure foundation; His purpose was to get down to the roots of character, teaching men, changing them, making them fit instruments for the spread of His truth; it was not until He had got from S. Peter that great confession of faith, 'Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God,'[2] that He could lay His foundation-stone. We may go further, and say that a great part of His method was to repel the careless and indifferent: 'Many believed on his name, . . . but Jesus did not trust himself unto them.'[3] His teaching, by its depths, its mystery, its stern demands on the life, held back those who were not really in earnest; He was continually sifting out those who were not loyally and sincerely accepting Him and His words. Would that this could be borne in mind nowadays! The object must be, not to fill the churches with crowds which will disappear when a change of *personnel* takes place, but to lay deep foundations, to build up ('edify') those who come; never forgetting the missionary side of the work, never allowing ourselves to be interested in the few alone, but at the same time remembering that the best of all missionary work will be done by the faithful —by the 'red hot centre.' 'He appointed twelve,

[1] H. S. Holland, *Creed and Character*, Serm. iii.
[2] S. Matt. xvi. 16. [3] S. John ii. 23, 24.

that they might be with him and that he might send them forth to preach."[1] These words must colour our ideas of the work of the Christian ministry.

It may be well to speak of a peril which is at times a real one, of elaborate ceremonial without any foundation of teaching. It is hard to imagine anything less likely to make good Christians than that. Vestments, incense, music are nothing without a deep faith, without penitence. God preserve us from such unreality! It is however a duty to give men as dignified and beautiful a form of worship as they are able to profit by; there exists in all of us, in greater or less degree, an æsthetic sense which must be intended to find its exercise, indeed to find its highest exercise, in the service of God; those who know best the lives of the very poor, the utter absence of beauty in their surroundings, and the dull monotony of their daily work, will understand the need of such an element in their lives as a dignified form of worship can supply.

So long as careful teaching as to faith and practice is given, we need not fear that terrible condemnation which the Prophets of Israel continually uttered against the superficial and unreal worship of the Jews.[2] A magnificent ceremonial is safe when it is the genuine expression of an inner life, but a true spirit of worship will never be secured where there is no thorough teaching. Too many sermons are exhorta-

[1] S. Mark iii. 14.

[2] *e.g.* Is. i., 11 ff.

tions and nothing more, with no solid basis of instruction in them at all: 'A few texts floating here and there in the turbid wash of your own feeble fancies.'[1]

Men must learn what worship means—that it is giving, not getting, and that 'it is more blessed to give than to receive.'[2] They must learn that we, God's creatures, owe worship to Him as the firstfruits of all our powers; that man is the High Priest of creation: 'the world's High Priest, who, made one with it by a like nature, by a common kinship, by closest ties of creaturely being, passes up from and before the eyes of that waiting world, within the veil, outside which it remains bowed in silent awe, and in earnest expectation—passes in, and up the steps of neighbourhood to God, the steps of thought, and meditation, and reflection, and memory, and fear, and love—until, within the Holy of Holies itself, in the name of all God's creatures, he does the things of God, he swings the censer of praise, he carries the offering, he stands and bows himself before that high altar, and ministers the service of praise and thanksgiving.'[3]

Worship is a first charge upon us—'my duty towards God is to worship Him.'[4] Worship, in its more limited sense of praise and adoration, is purely unselfish. Thanksgiving is a part, and a most

[1] Quoted from an unpublished address by Bishop S. Wilberforce, in *Lectures on Pastoral Work*, Bp. Walsham How, p. 111.

[2] Acts xx. 35. [3] H. S. Holland, *Logic and Life*, p. 106.

[4] Church Catechism.

important part of worship, but into our thanksgivings there enters the thought of what God has done for us. When we praise and adore God, self is forgotten, and we worship Him simply because of what He is. Further, the lesson which God taught the Jews of old needs emphasising now—that a worship of our own devising is displeasing to Him. The worship which Jeroboam instituted was rejected, not because it was intentionally schismatic, or idolatrous, but because it was 'after his own heart'; it was self-chosen. The same holds good in regard to the ceremonial of worship. The elaborate ceremonial regulations given by God to the Jews must at least have meant this, that the methods and ways by which man was to approach his Maker must not be of his own choosing, and that however little we may think of the importance of the details of worship, they are by no means unimportant in the eyes of God.

III

The more carefully we study the history of religion, whether in the Bible, or outside it, the more convinced we become that the divinely appointed method of approach to God has ever been 'Sacrifice.' The words of the Psalm express a great truth, 'Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice.'[1]

[1] Ps. l. 5.

We 'have an altar' in the Christian Church, and we have in the Eucharist the appointed Sacrifice; but many have had difficulty in grasping what is meant by the use of the term Sacrifice in this connection. They have found it almost impossible to get through the outward and visible associations of the word to its inner realities, to see for instance how the animal sacrifices of the Old Testament can come into the same category with the mystical sacramental Offering pleaded on the Altar of the Christian Church. So deeply imbued are they with the idea of sacrifice being something external and visible, that they cannot realise that the Old Testament sacrifices were types, and that in the Eucharist we possess that which fulfils to the utmost its true conception.

Sacrifice, even in its most simple and crude form, is an expression of yearning for the Personal Living God. This yearning of man's heart for fellowship with Almighty God is one of those deep truths of human nature on which all religion is based. It underlies the restless misery of a burdened conscience, and explains the craving for forgiveness which cannot be satisfied by any earthly means and refuses to be stifled.

'Recent investigation has tended to show that at least one deep root of sacrificial customs, if not *the* root, is the idea of communion or common sharing in a life believed to be divine. "We may now take it as made out," writes Dr. Robertson Smith, "that

throughout the Semitic field (the group of races to which the Jews belonged) the fundamental idea of sacrifice is not that of a sacred tribute, but of communion between the god and his worshippers by joint participation in the living flesh and blood of a sacred victim." "The one point that comes out clear and strong is that the fundamental idea of ancient sacrifice is sacramental communion, and that all atoning rights are ultimately to be regarded as owing their efficacy to a communication of divine life to the worshipper, and to the establishment or confirmation of a living bond between them and their God."[1]

So, too, S. Augustine defines sacrifice as 'any act that is done in order by a holy fellowship to inhere in God.'[2] Sacrifice, then, was the means by which the yearning for God could be satisfied. It is true of the Gentile sacrifices, but in the divinely ordained system of the Old Testament it is more prominent. To the Jews God revealed Himself as a holy God, and as One who demanded holiness of those who would have intercourse and fellowship with Him. The ceremonial law of the offerings is from end to end in all its elaborate arrangements a comment on the words 'without shedding of blood is no remission.' The words 'Be ye holy for I the Lord your God am holy' expressed one of the deep, underlying principles of the Old Testament dispensation. Constantly the

[1] Gore, *The Body of Christ*, pp. 12, 13. [2] *Ibid.* p. 19.

smoke of the sacrifices ascended before God, a perpetual witness to the Jew of his sin and his need of pardon. The sacrifice was that by which the broken fellowship was renewed. The smoke ascending before God represented God's acceptance of the sacrifice. The meal upon the sacrifice for union with God was its consummation. Part of the offering was eaten by the priest and by the worshippers, part was considered to be the 'Bread of God.'[1]

Yet the system of sacrifice, while it expressed man's need of God, at the same time bore witness to its own imperfection, by the ceaseless repetition of the same sacrifice, and by the obvious inadequacy of the victims for their purpose.[2] Its meaning and perfections were manifested when 'in the fulness of the time' there was offered upon the Cross the sacrifice of the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, 'Who made there, by His one oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.'[3]

'Christ died on the Cross as the great Sin-offering to restore the broken communion between man and God. In that supreme act of self-denying love, the surrender of His Person and Life, He showed the world the true meaning of sacrifice, the nature and end of all sacrificial worship. All heathen and Jewish sacrifices were thereby abrogated; the offering of all

[1] Lev. xxi. 6. [2] Cf. Hebr. x. 1-4. [3] Prayer of Consecration.

alien and remote material borrowed from the animal kingdom, which is given over to man for use, was set aside. Man could not but bring such offerings before, as shadows, substitutes and types of the one true and availing Sacrifice, while the partition wall of sin still stood between him and God, and the Divine Mediator, whose Person was the true oblation, had not yet appeared. But thenceforth, when God had bestowed His highest and noblest Gift, there could be but one offering, which enabled—nay obliged—men to give all to God without division, mingling, reserve, or limit of devotion, for the measure of their obligations is the measure of His gifts.'[1]

The sacrificial system then centres primarily round the Cross. The Cross throws its light back upon the past and forward into the future. Whatever sacrifice was offered in dimness and ignorance in the light of primitive revelation, in far-off ages, gained its value from this; each sacrifice offered by a pious Jew found there its meaning and its explanation.

'Our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' also is one with it, not indeed as those of old in type and figure merely, but in spiritual reality.

'Heaven and earth are full of' God's 'glory.' If our eyes could be opened and we could see the heavenly realities we should find how literally true are the words 'with Angels and Archangels and with all the Company of Heaven we laud and magnify

[1] Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, p. 239. (1867.)

Thy glorious Name';[1] how truly the 'spiritual life is around the earthly life.'

There is but one true Priest. He who stands to minister on earth at the visible altar is but the mouthpiece of the Great High Priest in heaven. Our ascended Lord is ever offering in His glory that which He offered in pain and suffering on the Cross:—not in actual words, but by His Presence there as God and Man, He is the propitiation for our sins.[2]

We know that He is also present at our Altars as our Offering—the antitype of all the victims offered in sacrifice of old—the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world. The mode of the Presence is wholly beyond the ken of our senses, but therefore is only the more real, as belonging to the world of spiritual facts—the world which cannot pass away—which is real as nothing tangible or earthly ever can be.[3]

The people, moreover, as they kneel in that mysterious Presence, know that the priest at the Altar is acting as the ministerial organ of the Body—that his ministry is not independent, but that he is voicing their worship.[4] Never once through the

[1] Preface in Holy Communion Service.

[2] Cf. Rom. iii. 25.

[3] He is 'sacramentally present with us by His own substance,' not in any carnal way, but 'by that mode of existing, which, although we can hardly express in words, we may, through thought illumined by faith, understand to be possible to God.' Quoted from Conc. Trid. (Sess. xiii. c. 1) by Forbes on Thirty-nine Articles, p. 554.

[4] Cf. Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, ch. iii.

service does the priest say 'I'; it is always 'we.'[1] His priestly offering is the people's as well as his, something in which they must really take part, to which they must be vitally united. So not only by bodily presence, but by attention, response, and, most important of all by devout communion, the people, sharing by virtue of their Baptism and Confirmation the priesthood of Christ, take their part in the sacrifice.

No thoughts of ours can, as we are at present constituted, rise to the level of these unseen realities; no words of ours can express them adequately. 'It is evident that most of the truths relating to the 'commerce' of God with the soul are necessarily veiled, and obscure to us in our present embodied condition, since they can never be properly expressed in terms of anything that falls under our senses—in terms of the only language we are skilled in.'[2]

Those who are humble enough to wait, and accept the fact that an imperfect grasp of divine truth may be, as far as it goes, entirely real, will to the utmost of their power press on to a deeper knowledge of what lies behind the veil; they will learn to 'go in and out and find pasture,' will find in the mysteries of Christian worship access to the heavenly facts, which they veil and reveal, an entrance into the 'heavenly places' which will enable them to look on life with

[1] Article in *Revue-Anglo-Romaine*, vol. ii. (1896), pp. 148, 149. [2] Tyrrell's *Hard Sayings*, p. ix.

very different eyes from those of men who live only in the visible world.

Could we bring home these truths to the minds and hearts of Englishmen to-day, we should do much to restore a true observance of Sunday. Men who believed them whole-heartedly and intelligently would be unable to neglect the duty of Sunday worship. As Sunday without worship has lost its meaning to them, so Sunday with worship would bring an unsuspected power and gladness into their lives.

There are, thank God, many places both in town and country, where the heart is refreshed by the sight of devout and reverent congregations coming together to plead the Holy Sacrifice; places where a high standard of worship and devotion is taught and practised. But for the most part our conception of worship has suffered from the neglect of clear teaching in the past as to the doctrine of the Sunday offering, and from the failure of the clergy to set before the people this service—the one service of our Lord's own appointment—in its position of pre-eminence. Until the revival of worship which followed upon the Oxford Movement, the Holy Mysteries were usually celebrated only monthly, more often quarterly, or in many places even less frequently than that. It must be admitted that still there are many parishes where lamentably few opportunities of Communion are given to the people.

The thought of the Eucharistic service being the

culminating act of the Church's worship had, in the Georgian era, practically disappeared. In emphasising the paramount need of Communion, the clergy had overlooked the Catholic idea of sacrifice. No one will be found to deny that actual participation is the highest purpose of the ordinance, or that only those who are partakers of the Holy Communion habitually are in the full sense 'partakers' of the sacrifice. But in laying stress on the importance of Communion we must be careful not to allow the sacrificial nature of service to be forgotten. It was largely due to the dislocation of the Liturgy which took place in the sixteenth century, when the act of Communion was brought into special prominence, that the sacrificial aspect came to be generally overlooked.

Thank God, much of this has been changed, and the general tone is different. We have been roused to a new sense of reverence towards the great Sacrament of the Altar, and in some measure its sacrificial aspect has been restored.

We need, however, at the present time to take a further step forward. If English people are to be brought to a right and due observance of Sunday, we must regain the balance of worship; we must make the Holy Communion service the central act of the day.

Few traditions are more deeply engrained in the minds of many devout English people than that of Morning Prayer being the chief service of the Lord's

Day; and it must not be forgotten that in such a tradition there is much that is to be respected. The service is an education in itself, and is most valuable, especially in its recitation of the Psalter, which is the heart of the offices. To use the Psalter, and to use it frequently, in union with her Divine Head, is one great work of the Church.[1] That Morning Prayer is, moreover, intended to be said in its proper place before the principal Eucharist of the day, a reference to the connection of the second morning lesson with the Gospel for the day on S. Thomas's Day or on Palm Sunday will show.[2] We must take the greatest care, while we emphasise the importance of the Eucharist, not even to appear to derogate from the true dignity of services which are the direct descendants of the old 'day offices' of the Church, and were intended to accompany the principal service. It would be an act of supreme folly to make light of or cast aside those noble liturgical offices which contrast so magnificently with modern popular devotions. It may be borne in mind that people who have been present at an early Eucharist are in no sense obliged to attend a second time; to do so may be to them a work of supererogation as it may be a weariness to the flesh. Moreover, though it is probably true to say that it takes years for uneducated people to be taught fully to appreciate Morning Prayer, or be brought through

[1] Cf. Benson, *The War Songs of the Prince of Peace*, vol. i. p. 5.
[2] See Appendix M.

it to the highest ideas of worship,[1] yet for educated people that service is of great value. When all has been said, the fact remains that we have no right to depart from that order which is clearly intended by the Church,[2] or to allow any other service to take the place of the one divinely appointed act of worship.[3] To make the Eucharist the central act of worship on the Lord's Day is obligatory on those who understand and accept the principles of the Catholic Church; and it is fair to say that those who interpret the Anglican formularies in the light of Catholic tradition are inconsistent if they do not do so.

It has been wrong that in past days the great majority of our people have been allowed to flock out of the church, as if they were excommunicate, in the middle of the service, so that they know nothing of the Holy Eucharist. It has been wrong that our children have not been brought to the service; we have no right to keep them away. Our duty is to teach them carefully what the service means; to help them to join in it intelligently and so prepare them for their future life as communicants. Dr. Milligan, the well-known Presbyterian writer, in his book on the Ascension of our Lord, says: 'Our children in Scotland remain in church during the celebration of the Supper, because they are not strangers.'[4] It is difficult to see how, when the sense of the obligation of

[1] See Appendix J. [2] See Appendix M. [3] See Appendix K.
[4] Milligan, *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood*, p. 304, note 1.

Eucharistic worship has so much died out amongst us, the English people are to be won back unless they learn as children what it means. That they should come with their parents is the ideal way; but it may be necessary that they should be brought in a body; and it is not difficult to arrange, at least where there is a fairly large staff of clergy, that one of the services should be specially adapted to them. Those who are most familiar with such services know how great can be the devotion and reverence of children.

This is not the place for entering into detail as to the best method of carrying these principles into practice; the circumstances of each parish vary too much. We must be infinitely patient in the methods we use, and ready to recognise to the full the difficulty that country people, and those who have been brought up in old-fashioned ways, have in accepting what is new to them. We shall never however restore to the English people true ideas of worship till we get back to its right position the great service of the Church—the one service which after all is most essentially Christian—the service which, as we find in the Acts of the Apostles, was the distinctive act of worship of the Lord's Day: surrounding it, as far as may be, with its traditional accessories, appealing as they do to the outward senses and bringing home to men the greatness of the act in which they are engaged. Many must know by experience how entirely

a man's idea of worship is raised when once the meaning of the Eucharistic service is realised.[1] With true ideas of worship will come a better observance of the Lord's Day; when once more men learn that in this service they can focus their praise, thanksgiving, penitence, and prayers, they will be strongly attracted, and will need no more urging to come to it.

'My duty towards God is to worship Him, to give Him thanks, to put my whole trust in Him, to call upon Him.'[2] These words state clearly the fourfold intention with which we offer the Holy Sacrifice. (1) It is our great act of Adoration; we offer our praises in union with Him in Whom the Father is well pleased, sheltering our unworthiness and littleness beneath His infinite merits—'accepted in the beloved.' (2) It is our Thanksgiving—our Eucharist. (3) It is our Sin-offering—'we put our whole trust in Him'; we plead the merits of His Cross and Passion, the 'one full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice' for the 'remission of our sins'; we offer It for others for whom we desire to pray, that they may obtain pardon. (4) It is our sacrifice of Prayer; we 'call upon Him' for all we need for ourselves, both for body and soul; concentrating all our petitions; laying down before Him all those, whether living or departed, for whom we are specially bound to pray.

[1] See Appendices L and J.

[2] Church Catechism.

'Father, see Thy children bending at Thy throne,
Pleading here the Passion of Thine only Son,
Pleading here before Thee all His dying love,
As He pleads it ever in the courts above.

'Not for our wants only we this Offering plead,
But for all Thy children who Thy mercy need;
Bless thy faithful people, win thy wand'ring sheep,
Keep the souls departed who in Jesus sleep.'

'Let the laity realise the share they too have in this offering—that it only depends upon them to unite themselves with Christ in His great act of intercession—and surely our Altars will be once more thronged, not only on Sundays but on week-days, and Englishmen will again find in the Eucharistic service of the Church the satisfaction of all their religious wants. The Holy Eucharist has an attraction which is exclusively its own. It is the most august, the most unchanging, as it is also the most elastic of services. It is an act which can be applied to all the various needs and necessities of every member of the human race. It is adapted to all conditions of men—high and low, rich and poor, it satisfies all alike. The ignorant, the uneducated, the simplest child can understand and take their part in it as well as the most educated, the most intelligent. Are we in joy?—here is the expression of our thanksgiving. Are we in sorrow?—here is the source of our consolation. None, living or dead, are outside the sphere of its influence, for

it is the application and perpetuation of that Sacrifice which was offered for all who ever have been or ever shall be born into the world.'[1]

IV

There is one essential feature of worship to which the Holy Eucharist bears the highest witness, namely, its corporate nature.

In these later days when the sense of our vital union with each other in Christ has grown weak, it is difficult to realise what corporate worship must have meant to the early Christians—to those who gathered together in the early morning at the peril of their lives to break the Bread of Life. They needed, it is true, even in the Apostolic age, to be reminded of the necessity for union—for even then there were divisions—but the sense of union with one another in the One Lord, of membership in the Body, of incorporation into the Christian family must have meant much to those who were called out from the hideous abominations of the heathen world. The divine life which knit them together went deeper and was more real than any of the divisions which tend to keep men apart. 'There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus.'[2]

[1] *The Lord's Day and the Holy Eucharist*, edited by Dr. Linklater, p. 25.

[2] Gal. iii. 28.

We cannot in our worship, any more than in our work, fulfil our responsibilities in a merely individual way; we are 'baptized into one Body,' and we must worship as members of that Body. 'I stay at home and read my Bible' is no valid excuse for missing the Church's corporate worship. Separation is weakness and failure. The Sacrifice which we plead in the Eucharist is essentially a corporate act; it is, as we have already seen, not merely the offering of the priest who stands at the Altar but of the people as well; rather of the whole Church, taken up into and identified with her Master.

Sunday, observed as a day of worship, will be a day of union, a day on which we realise and exercise our corporate life,[1] praising God, giving thanks to Him, praying in the fulness of that life, rising above our individual littleness into the power which is ours; remembering the Divine promise, 'If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven.'[2] We shall thus not only learn our strength, but also be roused to a sense of duties and responsibilities, which the majority of the lay people seem to appreciate but little. Many a man, who values a dignified service, is content to live a life in which there is but little of the element of sacrifice, and no very obvious devotion. This arises in a great degree from false ideas

[1] Cf. Ezek. xlvi. 1-3. [2] S. Matt. xviii. 19.

of the meaning of the priesthood. We hear much of sacerdotalism; we should hear little of it if truer ideas of the sacerdotal office were current amongst us. So long as the clergy are looked upon as a separate caste, so long as people speak of a man admitted to Holy Orders as 'going into the Church,' we shall have false ideas of the priesthood. The whole Church is a priestly body, by virtue of its union with its Head, Christ, the one Great High Priest. There is no priesthood but that which is in Him, and Christians are priestly, all of them, because they are by baptism incorporated into Him, because they have 'put on Christ,' are 'alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.' The function of the Church at large is to be 'the salt of the earth,' or, as S. Ignatius of Antioch phrased it, 'the soul of the world'; they must do for the many what the many will not do for themselves, must work, worship, pray. Their life must be, so far as God calls them to it, a life of sacrifice; thus filling up on their part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in their flesh for His Body's sake, which is the Church.[1]

If the laity believed these truths we should hear less of 'sacerdotalism,' for when once the priestly character of the whole Body is grasped, the actual relation of the clergy to the Church is easily seen. Those who are called to the ministerial priesthood gather up and express in a concentrated form that

[1] Cf. Col. i. 24.

which belongs to the whole Body; as at the altar they voice the adoration, thanksgiving, and petitions of the people, so they are specially bound to the life of self-sacrifice, to the reproduction on earth in simplicity of living and devotion of the life, labours, and self-surrender of the Great High Priest.[1]

As men get a fuller recognition of the priesthood of the whole Body and of their union in Christ, more of the spirit of sacrifice will enter into their worship. It will be found less difficult to get up on Sunday mornings; less necessary to be constantly reminded of the duty of worship. There will be a growing dread of the selfish, separated, impotent life, the life which no human being (even apart from the Christian motive) can ever have been intended to live.

Further, let this truth of the corporate priesthood of the Body be accepted, and we shall get over the too limited conception of 'obligation' which is apt to lay hold of men when once they have recognised that there are such things as obligations at all. For Christians to recognise that to them Sunday is practically not Sunday unless they have joined in offering the Holy Sacrifice is a step in the right direction; but when it leads to the idea that if a man has been present at the Altar at seven or eight o'clock in the morning he is perfectly justified in going off on a bicycle, or spending the day on the river without giving another thought to the worship of Almighty

[1] Cf. Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, ch. vii. § 2.

God, it cannot surely be said to be adequate. Those who have the opportunity of corporate worship on one day in the week only, can scarcely, one would imagine, be content on that day with attendance at one service.[1] This is, of course, a matter in which each man must be guided by his conscience, and some may be drawn to do more, some less; but to be contented not to join in the recitation of the Psalter at all, not to hear the Bible read in church, nor to unite with others in prayers and intercession, implies no very high conception of the place that worship should fill in the life of a Christian. 'Neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the Lord my God which cost me nothing'[2] would seem to be the only safe rule. Dr. Liddon says, 'It is not wise or reverent to suppose that all the religious duties of Sunday can be properly discharged before breakfast, and that the rest of the day may be spent as we like. No Christian whose heart is in the right place will think this. Later opportunities of public prayer and of instruction in the faith and duty of a Christian will be made the most of, as may be possible for each.'[3]

V

A general recognition of these truths would lead to a higher standard of worship throughout the

[1] See Appendix G.
[2] 2 Sam. xxiv. 24.
[3] *Easter Sermons*, the 'Lord's Day.'

land. May the day not be far distant, when daily, in all our cathedrals, the Holy Sacrifice shall be offered at the heart of the diocese! It often strikes lay people as strange that in a cathedral or abbey-church, to which a large staff of clergy is attached, the Holy Eucharist should not only be celebrated infrequently in the week, but that even on Sundays the priests attached to such churches should have so few opportunities given them of exercising the highest function of their priestly office. There is much which cathedral bodies can do in this, as in other matters, to uplift the standard of worship and devotion in our land.

It need not be confined to cathedrals; much may be done in our larger parish churches. The visitor to Paris can hardly fail to be struck by the number of large and noble churches to which colleges of clergy are attached. We have in England little analogous to this; here and there it may be possible for a parish church with a large staff of clergy, or for a religious community, or collegiate body to keep up a high standard of worship; but as things are at present, there is little that can be done in this direction. The expenses of such a service are too great to be met by an ordinary congregation, and the tenure of the clergy is usually too precarious. We need a few churches which are non-parochial, in which a standard of really dignified worship may be attained. Indirectly, as well as directly, such

churches would do much in raising the tone of worship throughout our land.

It is a mistake to think that the same level of worship and of ceremonial should be expected in every church. Probably in olden days the services of the ordinary parish church were very simple; there was no attempt to emulate the beauty of those offered to God in cathedrals and important churches. The materials used in such churches were less costly, the services less elaborate and magnificent. Our recognition of this fact, if it went hand in hand with the erection of beautiful churches, in which all that was best and most costly might be used in the service of God, would do much to solve some of our presentday difficulties.

God grant that in the years that are coming the Church in England may be so full of sympathy for her 'little ones'—whether in years or in understanding—that her services may be intelligible warm and attractive, and yet may set forth so dignified a standard of worship that her children may learn by degrees here below the lessons which shall fit them to take part perfectly in the heavenly worship hereafter!

THE OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY IN RUSSIA.

Mr. W. J. Birkbeck, whose intimate acquaintance with Russian ecclesiastical matters is well known, contributes the following account of a Russian Sunday.

Although as a rule every ecclesiastical term used in Russia, whether in the Old Slavonic or ecclesiastical

language, or in modern Russian as spoken at the present day,[1] corresponds to some similar term in the Greek ecclesiastical language, this is not the case with the Slavonic or Russian terms employed for the first day of the week. While we have the Western term *Dominica*, the Lord's Day, corresponding exactly with the Greek ἡ κυριακὴ, the terms used for Sunday in Russia are in no sense a translation of the Greek word. In the Old Slavonic language, in which all the services of the Church are read, and all the rubrics and liturgical directions of the Church are written, the term used for Sunday is *Nedjélja*, a word which means the day on which no work is done (*ne* not, and *djélatj*, to do), that is to say, a holiday. In the modern Russian language, although some traces of the ancient use of this word remain in other words derived from it,[2] the word *Nedjélja* itself is no longer employed for Sunday, but has come to mean a week:[3] while the term which is now used in ordinary Russian parlance, just as we use the word Sunday, is *Voskreséniе*, or the Resurrection, a word which both in the Slavonic and in the Russian language corresponds exactly with the Greek word ἀνάστασις.

These two words—*Nedjélja*, the holiday, and *Vos-*

[1] The Old Slavonic language, although a dead language, is very much closer to modern Russian than Latin is to Italian. Perhaps a comparison between the English of Spenser and the English of to-day would afford a parallel.

[2] e.g. *ponedjélnik*, Monday, literally, "the day *po*, after, *nedjélja*, the holiday."

[3] This is because the Sunday service gives the clue liturgically and musically for the ferial services of the whole week.

kreséniie, the Resurrection—exactly represent what Sunday is to the Orthodox Russian. Sunday is a holiday in honour of our Lord's Resurrection on the first day of the week from Joseph's grave. It will be said that the same thing is true of the Western Sunday. So it is in theory. But while, except on Easter Day itself and the Sundays which immediately follow it, the Western services contain little or no reference to our Lord's Resurrection, the Eastern services are full of it. Whether the Sunday fall in Eastertide or in Lent or on one of the series of Sundays after Pentecost, (which in the Eastern Church are not interrupted by Christmastide but are continued up to Septuagesima), the whole of the 'Proper of the Day,' so far as the service is of the Sunday, will be devoted to the celebration of our Lord's triumph over death and the grave: and even if some other festival coincide with the Sunday, there will always be some portions of the Sunday office retained. This is so, even in the case of the very greatest feasts, such as Christmas Day, or the other great feasts of our Lord or of His Mother. Just as, if Easter Day or Good Friday chance to fall upon the 25th of March, at least some portions of the Lady Day services will be inserted into the service for the day, so, if the Nativity or Assumption of the Holy Mother of God fall upon an ordinary Sunday after Pentecost, at least some portion of the Sunday service containing the praises of the Resurrection will be inserted.

It is hardly necessary to state that in Russia, as in every other Christian land whose Christianity has not been turned upside down, the principal service of Sunday, the service round which the whole observance of Sunday centres, is the Divine Liturgy, or to use the ordinary Western equivalent, the Mass. And while no written rules as to 'obligations' of attendance at this or any other service exist for the laity in Russia, still less any minute directions as to what exactly constitutes the fulfilment of such obligations, no Orthodox Russian would consider himself to have spent his Sunday as a Christian should without having been present at at least the more solemn parts of that service. However much curtailed be the other services[1] which correspond to what we know in the West as Choir Offices (Vespers, Matins, etc.), the Liturgy is always celebrated on Sunday, and celebrated in full. There is no such thing in the East as a Low Mass, or anything the least equivalent to it, on Sundays, or indeed on any other day: even if there be only two or three men present besides the priest, the whole service is sung throughout, and incense and all the other ceremonial accessories of the Church are employed; while the deacon, if there be one,[2] takes his allotted part throughout, as well as in the Vespers and Matins which precede it.

[1] Of this I shall speak lower down.

[2] About one church in four in Russia has a deacon attached to it as well as the priest.

The next point with regard to the Eastern observance of Sunday, which must be noted, is the prominence given to the fact that Sunday begins at sunset on Saturday evening. While this is again true in theory with regard to the West, there can be no comparison as to the degree of emphasis with which it is insisted upon both in the services of the Church and in the customs of the people. Any one who has studied the contemporary ecclesiastical life of the West knows that even in places, such as in some of the great French cathedrals, where the First Vespers of Sunday, perhaps followed by the Matins, are sung with becoming dignity and splendour, the churches are but poorly attended, whereas on Sunday afternoon at Second Vespers there will probably be a crowded congregation. In the East it is very different. It is to the Vespers of Saturday evening, which is often followed by Matins, that the people flock. Indeed in the East there is no such thing liturgically as the Second Vespers of Sunday or of any other day in the year: while the holiday of Sunday itself continues up to midnight, and this fact finds a certain expression in the services, in so far as the ordinary recitation of the Psalter (a twentieth part of the whole) is omitted at the Vespers, just as it is on all First Vespers of great feasts, the service itself is the First Vespers of Monday, devoted, as are all the Monday services, to the commemoration of the Holy Angels, and is in no sense a Sunday service, nor is it attended any more by the people than would be the

case on any other ferial service in the week. Indeed unless the Liturgy is going to be celebrated on Monday morning there are no Vespers on Sunday afternoon at all.

The legislation of the State entirely concurs in this arrangement. For instance, while the theatres are all open on Sunday evening, no Russian theatre[1] is allowed to open on Saturday evening or on the eves of the great festivals, any more than they would be allowed in Lent. And indeed wherever you may be in Russia on Saturday evening, there can be no misunderstanding as to the fact that Sunday has already begun. Who that has stood on the Kremlin terrace at Moscow on a Saturday evening at sunset can ever forget it? Whether it be in winter across the snow-clad landscape, or in summer over the red and green roofs of the white or parti-coloured houses, interspersed with the birch and other trees of the numerous gardens of the beautiful old capital, there will be heard the voice of the great bells of the belt of monasteries which surround it, as one by one they begin their call to prayer, which call is quietly taken up by the bells of the Kremlin cathedrals, and of each of the hundreds of parish churches of the white-walled, imperial city,

[1] By Russian theatres are meant the Opera and the theatres where plays are acted in the Russian language. In S. Petersburg, where a very large foreign element exists, there is sometimes a French or German company acting at one or other of the theatres, and in this case the legal prohibition does not apply, as they are supposed to be acting only for the delectation of Protestant or Roman Catholic foreigners.

crowned, as she is, with her chaplet of golden domes! There is nothing quite like it in all the world, and no one who knows Russia can doubt of the effect which it has upon the people or the hold which it has upon their hearts. I remember once talking to a pilgrim whom I met at one of the holy places in the north of Russia, and who in the previous year, on a pilgrimage to Mount Athos, had passed through the Bosphorus on a pilgrim steamer, and had anchored on Saturday afternoon for some hours in the entrance of the Golden Horn. He, like most Russian peasants, knew all about Constantinople, or, as they call it, *Tzarjgrad*, the city of the Tzar; and although he held a somewhat hazy view as to whether it was the Turks, the Germans, or the Papists which at present keep the Imperial City from its rightful owner, he seemed quite convinced that the day would come (which, God grant, and sooner rather than later!) when all would be right again, the Liturgy restored in the Great Church, and the Orthodox Emperor and the Ecumenical Patriarch would once more occupy their respective thrones under Justinian's great dome. But when asked whether he had gone on shore: 'How should I go on shore?' he replied: 'thou seest, there was no bell-ringing (*zvon*) and no all-night service, and so how was one to pray to God?'

Before proceeding further in describing the Russian Sunday services, we must not omit to mention the Russian *bani*, or vapour baths, one of the most

characteristic of Russian national institutions, through which the whole of the Orthodox population of Russia, man, woman and child, make a point of passing on Saturday afternoon before they make their appearance in church. Whether it be to the vast bath-houses of the two capitals, which in point of size and ugliness almost remind one of the barracks and board-schools which disfigure the streets of our large towns, or to the more modest one-storied bathing establishments of the smaller provincial towns, in the early part of Saturday afternoon the whole population may be seen hasting thither, with a bundle of dried birch branches, closely resembling a certain old friend of our school days, only with the dried leaves left on the twigs, with which to scrub themselves and each other, in one hand, and a towel, and clean change of linen (if they possess such a thing) in the other. No true Russian, however poor, ever dreams of dispensing with this admirable preparation for Sunday, which has its origin in certain ancient regulations of the Eastern Church. If one chances to be travelling with post-horses through the country districts of Russia on a Saturday afternoon or on the eve of a great festival, in every Orthodox village through which one passes, from the White to the Black Sea, or from the Baltic to the Pacific, one may see white jets of steam oozing out from between the logs of which a mysterious looking out-house at the back of each cottage is constructed. This is the bath-house. In one corner of it a heap of stones has

been heated to white heat on the top of burning charcoal, and then a bucket of water is thrown on the top, and thither every member of the family resorts sometime in the afternoon to perform their ablutions in the scalding steam. This is often followed in summer by a plunge into any neighbouring stream or lake, and in the winter by a rapid roll in the snow. But in any case the bath itself before Sunday is indispensable. To omit it on the part of a Russian peasant is to brand himself either as a Popish or as a German heretic!

We must now pass on to the Sunday services. These vary considerably according to place and circumstance as to time and length, more especially what we know in the West as the Choir Offices. The Vespers, Compline, Nocturns, Matins and the lesser Hours were, as in the West, originally drawn up for monastic use, and afterwards adopted by the secular clergy. On the other hand the East has never insisted upon, or even suggested, the private recitation of the Choir Offices by the clergy. If the Liturgy is to be celebrated, the Choir Offices from Vespers onwards must be recited publicly in the church, and never without singing, incense, and other ceremonial accompaniments according to rule. Of course in the monasteries and large churches, where there is a daily Liturgy, this involves a daily recitation of the offices, but when the Liturgy, as in the ordinary parish churches, is only celebrated on Sundays and

on the somewhat numerous Church festivals and public holidays, the Choir Offices follow suit.

Another point of contrast to be noticed between East and West is the greater freedom which exists in the East with regard to how much of the offices shall be recited. The Western word Breviary tells its own tale. It marks a period, or rather a succession of periods in which the Divine Office was shortened in order to adapt it to fresh needs in the monastic life, and to the use of the secular clergy. In the East there have been no such reforms of the services: they still appear in the service books at full length just as they were drawn up for use in such great monasteries as the Studium at Constantinople or the famous sanctuaries of Mount Athos. But inasmuch as for ordinary purposes these offices are far too long—the ordinary Sunday service if sung in full would take literally the whole night[1]—the services are in practice curtailed in various ways, unauthorised by the letter of the rubrics, but on the lines of a well-defined and recognised unwritten tradition, or rather custom. The main outline of the services will always be maintained. There is, for instance, nothing in the East at all analogous to the omission of one out of the two Gospel Canticles at Evensong, a slovenly custom not quite unknown amongst ourselves. But certain portions of the service will be read where the rubrics appoint them to be sung, or perhaps in places where a whole psalm is appointed

[1] Hence the name παννυχίς, or 'all-night service.'

to be sung on account of the contents of one or two of its verses, these verses will be sung, and the rest omitted altogether. It may, I think, roughly be stated that while in a monastery the Choir Offices on a Sunday take from four to six hours altogether, in a parish church they seldom exceed two and a half. The Liturgy itself, except in the case of two long psalms, which come into the earlier part of the service, is never shortened. It usually takes rather over an hour in an ordinary parish church.

The times of the services are as far as possible regulated by the hour of sunset and sunrise. The service books direct that the Vespers should begin rather before sunset, the object being that the latter may as nearly as possible coincide with the 'Hail, gladdening light' (*Φῶς ἱλαρὸν*), which comes almost in the middle of the service, and contains the words: 'Now that we have come to the setting of the sun, and have seen the light of evening, we hymn the Father, Son, and Spirit, God.' Similarly, the Matins are, if possible, timed so that the rising of the sun should as nearly as possible coincide with the point near the end of the service where, just before the choir commence the singing of *Gloria in excelsis*, the priest standing in front of the altar exclaims with a loud voice: 'Glory to Thee who hast showed the light.' But whereas in Greece, whose more southern latitude entails but a trifling change (comparatively) in the length of the nights and days at different times in the

year, these directions can, at least approximately, be complied with without serious inconvenience; in Russia, on the contrary, whose territory extends over more than thirty degrees of latitude, the matter is attended with much more difficulty. Indeed in the northern parts of the Empire, where the sun hardly sets in summer and hardly rises in winter, to follow these directions literally is altogether out of the question. They can only be fulfilled in intention by commencing the Vespers several hours later, and the Matins several hours earlier in summer, than in winter. Thus in S. Petersburg there is a variation of four hours for the time of commencing Vespers at the various seasons of the year. At Moscow it is not so much, owing to its comparatively southern latitude.

As far as the Sunday services are concerned, they may be arranged in two ways. The normal service for Saturday evening (as for the eves of nearly all great festivals) is the παννυχὶς[1] or, 'all-night' service, consisting of Vespers, followed by Matins and Prime; and this is the form which the service takes in monasteries and almost all cathedral and parish churches in the towns. In the country villages, however, at any rate in the summer time, I have generally found Matins said in the morning and only the Vespers said the night before; shortly after which

[1] In Slavonic: *vsjénoshchnaja*, a literal translation of the Greek word. The Greek word itself, with a Slavonicised termination, *pannykhída*, is in Russia used exclusively for Matins of the dead, or a shortened form of the same.

the priest, after perhaps taking some light refreshment, retires, and says Compline and the evening portion of his preparation for his Communion next day. This is of considerable length, and is, I believe, generally read aloud. With respect to the fast before Communion, the Orthodox Church not only insists upon a total abstinence from all food or drink after midnight, but recommends the same, or at least a very sparing use of food during the evening before:[1] while as far as the laity are concerned, it is the custom in the villages even for those who are not going to make their Communions to wait until after the Liturgy for their first food. The Matins are in summer usually sung at five in the morning, and the Liturgy probably begins at seven or eight o'clock, and is over soon after nine. But it is impossible to give any fixed rules on this subject. In some places the service lasts much longer. The following extract contains the account which I wrote of a Sunday service in a village in the Mohammedan districts to the East of the Volga.

'We spent Saturday night at the house of a Tartar priest. A few years ago, except about forty Russians, there was not a Christian in the village. But a rich merchant in Kazan

[1] 'And whereas much eating and drinking in the evening is a hindrance to the worthy celebration and reception of the holy Mysteries: therefore it is meet that the priest abstain altogether from food and drink from the fall of evening, or at least eat something extremely small: while from midnight certainly he must not eat anything at all: and if he should taste ought, even a small [particle] of food or drink after midnight, let him by no means dare to celebrate, inasmuch as the natural day commences at midnight.' Cautel from the *Sluzhebnik* (Missal).

had built a church and schools, and when I was there there were ninety-two pupils in the schools, while three hundred and fifty adult Tartars had made their Easter Communion. The Sunday morning service, which was very long, lasting from five till past eleven, with only a short interval between Matins and the Liturgy, was beautifully sung, for the most part by the congregation in the Tartar language, although one side of the choir occasionally sang in Slavonic for the benefit of the few Russian inhabitants of the place; while several parts of the Liturgy, including the Epistle, Gospel, Creed, and Lord's Prayer, were read or sung in both languages, one after the other. After the priest's Communion, he preached a short sermon upon the Gospel for the day in both languages, and then something over thirty children of various ages under seven received the Holy Communion. The service ended by the distribution of the *antidoron*, which is the first food taken. I never saw, even in Russia, a more devout congregation, and it is quite difficult to realise that thirty years ago there was not a Christian in the village.'

The Choir Offices of the Eastern Church are so long and so complicated, that it would be impossible to give a full description of the contents of the Sunday services in the present paper. Whereas we have only one variable collect for the Sunday, the Eastern service books provide one hundred and thirty variable portions for the day itself, belonging to different parts of the service, without including those which are inserted for whatever saint happens to be commemorated on that day of the month. This will show that it is out of the question to attempt to describe them here.

NOTE

On the use of Saturday Evening as a time of preparation for the Sunday Communion

Many customs of the Early Church, which have fallen into disuse, may with great advantage be revived to meet the needs of the present day.

The custom of beginning the special observances of a holy day on the evening of the previous day may be held to belong to this class.

The origin of this custom in the primitive reckoning of time from evening to evening, and in the Jewish idea that the Sabbath commenced at six o'clock on Friday evening, is shown in the Rev. J. R. Milne's pamphlet given in Appendix M.

The early Christians would naturally carry on this arrangement in the observance of Sunday and the other festivals of the Church. The account of the service conducted by S. Paul at Troas[1] seems to show this. The congregation assembled on the evening of Saturday (the beginning of the 'first day of the week') spent the night in prayer and in listening to S. Paul's preaching, and on Sunday morning joined in the Lord's day service, the Breaking of Bread.

The rubric in the Book of Common Prayer which prefaces the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels is as follows: 'Note, that the Collect appointed for every Sunday, or for any Holy Day that hath a Vigil or Eve, shall be said at the Evening Service next before.' This fully warrants the desire to revive this custom in the present day.

In many churches it is usual to follow out this leading of the Prayer Book by emphasising the First Evensong of Saints' Days; in very few churches is the eve of Sunday observed in any way. Would it not be possible to do so more generally, and to make Saturday evening a time of preparation for the Sunday Communion?

Canon Armitage Robinson, in his paper in the *Commonwealth* of August 1902, throws out a hint of the good effect which this might have in counteracting the habit of working men giving

[1] Acts xx. 7-12.

only the last part of Sunday to religious observance. He says: 'Saturday afternoon is variously spent: Saturday evening is devoted to amusement till a late hour: Saturday night finds shopping still to be done, for meat which must be sold off cheapens at the last moments. Then in the small hours of Sunday comes a supper which justifies a slumber till after two of the Sunday services are over. . . . It seems clear to me that we must cut at the root of his neglect of the first half of Sunday —its most precious half, when he is most needed as a member of the Body to help to realise its sacred fellowship—by teaching him to spend his Saturday evening better.'[1]

It is impossible here to do more than suggest that the clergy should give this matter their serious attention, and that the faithful should use their best endeavours to set apart time to be spent in Church on Saturday in preparation for their Sunday worship. Thus to gain a quiet Saturday evening would be a step in the right direction; but it would still fall far short of the solemn treatment of Saturday as the eve of Sunday described in the preceding note.

[1] This point is further dwelt on by Canon Brooke in an article in the same number of the *Commonwealth*.

CHAPTER VII

REST

We have been considering the God-ward aspect of life and its duties. We now pass on to consider more fully that gift of life and its personal responsibilities.

'Life,' says Dr. Westcott, 'is our universal and priceless treasure. This is acknowledged conventionally, but it is hardly taken seriously. Our insensibility to the meaning of life is one of its greatest mysteries. We occupy ourselves unceasingly with the means and accidents of life, which belong to its manifestation under the conditions on earth, with the pursuit of pleasure, or power, or wealth, or knowledge, but life itself, with its infinite potentialities, seems to escape from our thoughts. We were born for life, and we measure it by threescore years and ten.'[1]

The nature which God has given us is strangely complex; we are 'fearfully and wonderfully made.' Possessing as we do a nature both spiritual and material, we belong, as no other of God's creatures, to two worlds. We are spiritual beings made in the

[1] *Lessons from Work*, p. 250.

image of God, yet belonging also to the world of visible things.

Justice to ourselves demands that we should allow this life full development. That there is such a thing as justice to self is implied in the familiar words—'My duty towards my neighbour is to love him as myself.' Scholastic writers in expounding the virtue of justice divide it under three heads: justice towards God, one's self, and one's neighbour. We may go on therefore to think of the Lord's Day as a divinely given opportunity for the development of individual life.

I

Justice to self involves the due and proper care of our bodily powers. The body is the tenement, the envelope of the soul, its companion in this world and for eternity. A Christian can never doubt the value or the sanctity of his body:—'God saw everything that he had made and behold it was very good.'[1] God created nothing evil; if the body is difficult to manage, it is because human nature is unbalanced, because the body is master when it should be servant. Very mysterious is the relation of the soul to the body. 'This intellectual spirit and mortal flesh exist together in a wonderful and inexplicable communion of life and personality.' 'Heaven and earth meet in

[1] Gen. i. 31.

the soul of man . . . the soul thinks through the mind, feels through the senses, and acts from the will.' Bearing this in mind we shall understand better the true position of man. God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion.'[1] Man is God's Vicegerent upon earth. 'The man of faith, who is just to the divinely established order of things, is the living link between earth and heaven, the spiritual bond of communion between the creature and the Creator. He subjects the world to himself, and himself to God. As God's representative he administers the things of this world, as they are committed to his keeping, and according to the will of his Lord. God has made him both king and priest, to rule them reasonably, and to offer them devoutly to the praise and glory of their Creator and Lord. As they are devoid of reason, his reason supplies for them by his faith and his devotion; in him as in a living temple God's image is set up, His likeness is exhibited, and His authority represented, that through him the inferior creature may do homage to God, and render obedient service.'[2]

Could we bear in mind God's design, and lay to heart the true dignity of our position, we should no longer allow the body with its passions and cravings to rule us:—'he who rules not himself can rule nothing rightly'; the soul cannot govern well or

[1] Gen. i. 26. [2] Ullathorne, *Endowments of Man*, pp. 67, 68.

wisely through a rebellious minister;—one of the main characteristics of our life would be the gradual subjugation of the body to the soul, that we might be able to say from the heart 'we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee.'[1]

We must start from the sound premiss that the body is not in itself evil but that the evil lies in the disordered will. The Christian strives to discipline his body with different motives from the Eastern ascetic, who treats it as an evil thing *per se*: he can never forget that his bodily nature has been sanctified by the Incarnation of the Son of God; he finds the true dignity of his body in the statement that the 'Word was made Flesh'; he knows that the Eternal Son took to Himself the sum total of man's nature. If the body were in itself evil, if material things were in themselves bad, the Incarnation would have been an impossibility.

The whole sacramental system of the Church of God is a witness to the truth of the sanctity of the body. On it S. Paul bases his appeal to Christians for purity:—'Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ?' 'Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have from God? and ye are not your own?' and the practical exhortation follows, 'Glorify God there-

[1] Holy Communion Service, Prayer of Oblation.

fore in your body.'[1] The explanation of the dignity of the body is found in the mysterious union wrought by the Sacraments between it and the Body of the risen Lord.

Thus the Christian has a duty towards his body. He is bound to subdue it and keep it in order, not because it is intrinsically evil, or from any motive of false spirituality, but because for the body to be the 'predominant partner' is fatal to right living. He further recognises it as a duty to develop all its powers in order that he may be a 'vessel . . . sanctified, meet for the master's use.' A body unfit for its proper work is a drag upon the higher spiritual nature, not 'the helpmeet for it' that God intended it to be. It needs, as a spirited horse does, curbing and training, but not crushing. Its passions and appetites are, like all else that God has made, 'very good'—means towards holiness and intrinsically noble. A fuller recognition of this fact would do much to root out many false and misleading ideas.

No one has expressed more vigorously the true sanctity of the body than Mr. Coventry Patmore. 'The power of the soul for good is in proportion to the strength of its passions. Sanctity is not the negation of passion, but its order.' 'Happy he who has conquered his passions, but far happier he whose servants and friends they have become.'[2]

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 15, 19, 20. [2] *Rod, Root, and Flower*, pp. 40, 166.

This consideration of the balance of our nature bears directly on the question of Sunday rest. Though rest has too often been wrongly made the chief, rather than the subordinate, end of the day, it nevertheless has an important part to play in its observance. Our bodily powers would soon wear out if there were not one day set apart for rest and recreation. If the labourer has to work, as so many have to do, seven days in every week;[1] if the clerk has to sit at his desk without any intermission but the brief annual holiday; if the grinding round of social calls is not intermitted even on one day in the week, our bodily powers will rapidly fail. The attempt made in connection with the French Revolution to set apart one day in ten as a day of rest, instead of one in seven, ended in failure.

Bodily rest, and that apparently in the proportion of one day in seven, is needed to prevent toil from becoming mechanical, to keep men from having their best powers submerged, and to secure freshness and originality in work.

II

Rest is necessary for the body; it is not less so for the mind. The mind cannot always be at work without evil results. It may be that the modern habit of taking our opinions at second hand is the result of ceaseless work on a mental treadmill. Many

[1] See Appendix N.

persons never get time really to think, and if they did the brain would be too much exhausted to exert itself.

A quiet Sunday is an opportunity for mental development, and especially for growth in knowledge of religious truth, which also we are far too apt to take at second hand, picking it up from manuals, seldom 'digging' for ourselves.[1] S. Paul writes from Rome during his first captivity: 'For this cause I also, having heard of the faith in the Lord Jesus which is among you, and which ye show toward all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers; that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him; having the eyes of your heart enlightened, that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints.'[2] 'And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and all discernment'[3] 'For this cause we also, since the day we heard it, do not cease to pray and make request for you, that ye may be filled with the knowledge of his will in all spiritual wisdom and understanding.'[4] So S. Peter writes: 'Grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.'[5]

The Apostles in such passages as these, by taking

[1] See Ruskin, *Sesame and Lilies*, p. 24, seventh edition, 1886.
[2] Eph. i. 15-18.
[3] Phil. i. 9.
[4] Col. i. 9.
[5] 2 S. Peter iii. 18.

for granted such a possibility of growth in spiritual insight and wisdom, shame us, and make us feel how shallow our knowledge of religious truth is apt to be. It must be remembered that wider diffusion of critical knowledge of the Bible can never take the place of personal grasp of its teaching, nor can the possession of many books of devotion ever be a substitute for the patient study of God's truth. 'Sayest thou this of thyself,' said our Lord to Pilate, 'or did others tell it thee concerning me?'[1] We may imagine His asking us this question, and for answer may call to mind the reply of the Samaritan men to the woman who had first brought the truth to them,—'Now we believe, not because of thy speaking: for we have heard for ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world.'[2] Religious knowledge moreover to be worthy of the name must be won by effort. 'The true knowledge is disciplined and tested knowledge.' 'This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.'[3]

Indeed it is specially needed at the present day that men should use their mental powers on religious subjects, for in many ways old beliefs have been, or seemed to be, shaken. The growth of scientific knowledge, the flood of light poured upon traditional views of the Bible—these and other such causes have tended

[1] S. John xviii. 34. [2] S. John iv. 42.
[3] S. John vi. 29.

to unsettlement of simple faith; for with increased light has not always come clearer vision. There is a tendency to accept whatever is negative and destructive, whether it comes from the side of science, or of criticism, without any attempt at cautious investigation. That men should be shaken, even roughly, in beliefs which they never had really made their own, but only superficially adopted, is an undeniable gain, but they must go on to build up their faith on a surer foundation. A faith which is worth having can only be won through effort, prayer, and venture, by those who long for the light and seek for it, who pray 'O send out thy light,' who ask, Who is the Lord, that I might believe on Him? and who, when they see glimmerings of that light, are prepared to make a venture, and strive to conform their lives to it at whatever cost. To such as these fresh light will always be gain, not loss.

We need, if ever men did, to cultivate the hearing ear and the understanding heart. 'When we look upward and try to think of God, and of the soul's relation to Him, we are apt to feel as if we had stepped out into a world in which the understanding finds little or no real footing. We cannot present to ourselves these truths adequately and fully . . . The fact is, those root-truths, on which the foundations of our being rest, are apprehended not logically at all, but mystically. This faculty of spiritual apprehension, which is a very different one from those which are

trained in schools and colleges, must be educated and fed, not less, but more carefully, than our lower faculties, else it will be starved and die, however learned or able in other respects we may become. And the means which train it are reverent thought, meditation, prayer, and all those other means by which the divine life is fed.'[1]

The truth of these words will be recognised by many who know what it is to meditate daily or to go aside out of their ordinary occupations for three or four days into a 'Retreat.' Such a time of quiet helps them to regain their sense of perspective: temporal things are estimated at their true value: eternal things, which are real because they will never pass away, regain their right proportion; the 'spiritual life around the earthly life'[2] becomes visible once more; the better desires and aims wake up, motives and ideals which had lost their power revive; the knowledge which is most truly knowledge,—namely of God and self, is seen to outweigh all else; and all because there is rest, because the jarring stir and fretful anxiety of daily life are for the moment stilled.[3]

III

But this atmosphere of quiet and rest needs cultivation, and cultivation implies effort. As it is, many

[1] Shairp, *Culture and Religion*, pp. 80 ff.
[2] R. Browning, 'An Epistle—Karshish.'
[3] Milman, *Love of the Atonement*, pp. 1, 2.

people find that an atmosphere of restless fidget environs them; just as it is by no means uncommon to come across people whose lives have become so mechanical and dulled by routine, that even to take a holiday needs a great effort of will. Inability to rest may, if it becomes a habit, almost amount to a vice. Some of us are apt to smile contemptuously at the man who can sit for a whole day in a punt on the Thames, content perhaps to catch nothing. If we are unable however to be quiet and do nothing, if ever we cannot be happy without movement or excitement, it probably means that we have got into an abnormal state which is more perilous than that of the man who knows how to be wisely idle and so to recreate his powers of mind and body.

Few people suffer more from the restless wear and tear of the age than the clergy in our great towns. Their work has no clearly assigned limits; like medical men they never know when their day's work ends; indeed, it never can end if they are conscientiously devoted to it.[1] The clergy must legislate for themselves, must get their quiet spaces at stated times or on stated days, if mind and body are to be kept healthy; and the laity, by considerateness, should help to make it possible for them to do so.

It is not only the clergy whose Sundays suffer thus. There is little rest for many a Sunday school teacher who is trying to do his duty. His day probably

[1] See Appendix O.

begins with the early Communion ; then, after a hurried breakfast, comes the Sunday school with its wear and tear, followed by a long morning service, lasting, in some cases, till after one o'clock. In the afternoon comes Sunday school again, or a Bible class, followed by a children's service, and another service in the evening ; and the person who does all this is hard at work every day in the week, and never gets time to read or think. If the laity should protect the clergy, as suggested above, it is equally needful for the clergy to protect the laity, even in their own interest, —if, that is, they wish to have efficient teachers or fellow-workers. It is absurd to try to teach others when we are not learning ourselves, and to learn is impossible when there is no time to read, think, or pray. Those who do God's work should remember how S. Augustine says of God Himself in words already quoted that He 'is always active, always at rest,' or how Matthew Arnold contrasts the calm of nature with man's fretful activity :

> 'Yes, while on earth a thousand discords ring,
> Man's senseless uproar mingling with his toil,
> Still do thy quiet ministers move on,
>
> Their glorious tasks in silence perfecting ;
> Still working, blaming still our vain turmoil ;
> Labourers that shall not fail, when man is gone.'[1]

We see in the perfect life on earth of God Incarnate the element of quiet and rest :—'Mine hour is not yet

[1] 'Quiet Work.'

come,'[1]—'My time is not yet come; but your time is alway ready.'[2] Of His thirty-three years on earth, He spent thirty in the quiet home at Nazareth; even in the years of His active ministry a large proportion of His time was spent in retirement; forty days in the desert, and long nights in prayer; while S. John the Baptist in like manner was prepared for his thirty months of active work by his thirty years of solitude in the desert.

The same quiet marked the life of her who 'kept all these things and pondered them in her heart.'

> 'From her mother's knee
> Faithful and hopeful; wise in charity;
> Strong in grave peace; in pity circumspect.
>
> So held she through her girlhood; as it were
> An angel-watered lily, that near God
> Grows and is quiet.'[3]

The quiet orderliness of the life of our Lord on earth has never been better expressed than in the following words:—

'Consider what was the first and prominent feature of that perfect life as we saw it. It was, I suppose, the combination in it, most intimate and never interrupted, of the work of time and human life with that which is beyond sight and time. It is vain to try to express in words that of which nothing but the Gospels open before us can adequately convey the

[1] S. John ii. 4. [2] S. John vii. 6.
[3] D. G. Rossetti, 'Mary's Girlhood.'

extent—the impression left on our minds of One who, all the while He was on earth, was in heart and soul and thought undivided for a moment from heaven. He does what is most human; but He lives absolutely in the Divine. However we see Him—tempted, teaching, healing, comforting hopeless sorrow, sitting at meat at the wedding or the feast, rebuking the hypocrites, in the wilderness, in the Temple, in the Passover chamber, on the Cross—He of whom we are reading is yet all the while that which His own words can alone express, "even the Son of Man which is in heaven." The Divine Presence, the union with the Father, is about Him always, like the light and air, ambient, invisible, yet incapable, even in thought, of being away. And yet with this perpetual dwelling and conversing with God, to which it were blasphemy to compare the highest ascents of the saintliest spirit, what we actually see is the rude hard work and sufferings by which He set up among men the Kingdom of God. What the most devout contemplation, detached from all earthly things, could never attain to, was in Him compatible with the details and calls of the busiest ministry: yet labour and care, and the ever-thronging society of men, came not for an instant between Him and the Father; and even we, with our dim perception of that Divine mystery, cannot think of Him without that background of heaven, not seen, but felt in all He says and does. . . . No recluse conveys so absolutely the idea of abstraction from the

world as our Lord in the thick of His activity. Than that heavenly-mindedness, it is impossible to conceive anything more pure and undisturbed. Than that life of unwearied service, it is impossible to conceive anything more absolute in self-sacrifice.' [1]

Those who live in large towns cannot but feel that the restless unquiet spirit is one of our great perils. We have amongst us still, thank God, some

> 'Who carry music in their heart
> Through dusky lane and wrangling mart,
> Plying their daily task with busier feet,
> Because their secret souls a holy strain repeat.' [2]

But most of us know full well that ceaseless competition, restless activity, grinding monotony are wearing away our real inner life. Restlessness is the curse of the age; it dims the spiritual vision and robs the inner life of vigour. No writer has expressed this more clearly or more often than Matthew Arnold :—

> 'For most men in a brazen prison live,
> Where, in the sun's hot eye,
> With heads bent o'er their toil, they languidly
> Their lives to some unmeaning taskwork give,
> Dreaming of naught beyond their prison-wall,
> And as, year after year,
> Fresh products of their barren labour fall
> From their tired hands, and rest
> Never yet comes more near,

[1] Dean Church, *Gifts of Civilisation*, pp. 91-94.
[2] Keble, *Christian Year* (S. Matthew's Day)

Gloom settles slowly down over their breast;
And while they try to stem
The waves of mournful thought by which they are prest,
Death in their prison reaches them,
Unfreed, having seen nothing, still unblest.'[1]

'And we say that repose has fled
For ever the course of the river of Time.
That cities will crowd to its edge
In a blacker incessanter line;
That the din will be more on its banks,
Denser the trade on its stream,
Flatter the plain where it flows,
Fiercer the sun overhead.
That never will those on its breast
See an ennobling sight,
Drink of the feeling of quiet again.'[2]

'This is the curse of life! that not
A nobler, calmer train
Of wiser thoughts and feelings blot
Our passions from our brain;

But each day brings its petty dust
Our soon-choked souls to fill,
And we forget because we must
And not because we will.'[3]

. . . . .

'We see all sights from pole to pole,
And glance, and nod, and bustle by
And never once possess our soul
Before we die.'[4]

. . . . . .

He longs for the

'. . . days when wits were fresh and clear,
And life ran gaily as the sparkling Thames,
Before this strange disease of modern life,
With its sick hurry, its divided aims,
Its head o'ertax'd, its palsied hearts was rife.'[5]

[1] 'A Summer Night.' [2] 'The Future.' [3] 'Absence.'
[4] 'A Southern Night.' [5] 'The Scholar Gipsy.'

Though it is true that the wear and tear of life are the chief cause of this restlessness, yet even those whose lives are leisurely are affected by it. Many who have plenty of time to do all that is or ought to be required of them become fretted eager and worried in a perfectly needless way: it is the fashion to be in a hurry. Frequently even those whose nerves have given way, or who have broken down through overwork, refuse to accept the rest from work which God has thus imposed upon them.

The most serious result of this restlessness is that, even when we have time to pray, or to hold communion with God, we cannot do it; we have lost the power, the wear and tear has caused a spiritual anæmia. We talk to a friend; we take up a newspaper, a novel; do anything rather than make the necessary effort to commune with our own hearts and be still. Pascal tells us that all this is the outcome of man's dread of really knowing himself as he is, of really facing fundamental truths. 'Nothing is so insupportable to man as to be completely at rest, without passion, without business, without diversion, without study. He then feels his nothingness, his loneliness, his insufficiency, his dependence, his weakness, his emptiness. At once, from the depth of his soul, will arise weariness, gloom, sadness, vexation, disappointment, despair.'[1]

[1] *Pensées*: translation by C. Kegan Paul, p. 40. See whole section on 'Diversion.'

Each year, moreover, as it passes makes it increasingly difficult to pull ourselves together, if such a habit of dissipation of energy has unhappily laid hold of us; yet meanwhile we are growing older, our bodies are decaying, their powers growing less. Old age will be bitter and weary to us if, as the body grows weaker, the inner self does not grow stronger. If there has been no quiet for thought, no storage of experience, we shall be useless to those younger than ourselves who will look to us for guidance and expect of us wisdom; for no one can draw water out of a dry well. 'Distraction within is the way to make life useless and barren.'[1] The old age of those who have never learned to think will be a poor and worthless thing. 'I have written unto you, fathers,' says S. John, 'because ye know him which is from the beginning.'[2] Those to whom the Apostle wrote had hold of Him in Whom alone is to be found strength and peace; they could face old age; in them it would be fruitful.

If we shall be unfit for old age, still more shall we be unfit for the presence of God hereafter. It is the pure in heart who see God. Even S. John who leaned on our Lord's breast at supper 'fell at his feet as one dead'[3] when he saw Him in His glory; we cannot be presumptuous enough to suppose that we, being what we are, shall be fit without prepara-

[1] Hort, *The Way, the Truth, and the Life*, p. 218.
[2] 1 S. John ii. 14. [3] Rev. i. 17.

tion; and preparation without rest and quiet thought is impossible.

> 'We all aspire to heaven: and there is heaven
> Above us: go then! dare we go? no, surely
> How dare we go without a reverent pause,
> A growing less unfit for heaven?' [1]

The cultivation of the 'quiet mind,' which will make prayer and meditation possible, and will alone enable us to do solid work for God, should be one great end of the Sunday rest. The modern 'idolatry of bustle' is no imaginary peril. A friend writes: '"The world is so full of a number of things," as Stevenson's verse says, that I think we need more and more something very real and strong to bring back our thought and interest to what is after all the main concern of life, the two great commandments of the Law, and Sunday properly used surely does this as nothing else can.'

'A man must be still, he must give himself time to think, he must pause in his earthly cares and labours, and in his wild, impatient, fretful hurrying on after earthly things, else he will know nothing of God; he may say good words, he may remember prayers and psalms which he has learned, he may now and then have good thoughts hurrying across his mind, as bright spots of clear sky come out for short intervals in a wild, windy day among the clouds. I say a man who is always in this world's work may now and then

[1] R. Browning, *A Soul's Tragedy*.

have thoughts of God, but he cannot really come to know Him without sometimes being "still," without having Sabbaths, that is, times of rest, and hallowing them—*i.e.*, giving them to God.'[1]

IV

The grinding, money-making, competitive spirit of the day affects every class of society. 'The Rural Exodus,' which is so lamentable a fact nowadays, is largely due to rebellion against the dulness of our villages. Men cannot tolerate quiet, and so the excitement and wearing grind of a town life, with its miserable poverty and overcrowding, is preferred to the 'dulness' of the country. But in that town life there is neither space nor time for quiet. Those who best understand the lives of the poor in our great towns and cities know the practical impossibility of their securing quiet in their homes, and how great are the sins, how lamentable the deadness and indifference to all but material needs which often follow from this continual publicity; there is no ideal for this life, no looking beyond into another; none of the comfort to be won from the knowledge that 'imperfection means perfection hid.' The practice of religion has ceased to have any meaning for the majority. It is not that people are hostile to it; rather it fails to touch or appeal to them; the

[1] Keble, *Sermons on the Christian Year*, vol. xi. serm. 31.

sensitive points in their nature seem blunted. Mr. Charles Booth, whose authority in such matters is unquestioned, says, 'The degradation which follows from excessive hours of labour takes different forms. It may even be compatible with regular work, good wages, and abundant food; for too long hours tend to create a mechanical and absorbed mind, indifferent alike to home and to the wider interests of life. Such degradation is frequently undetected, and is, indeed, more subtle, because more self-absorbing than the extremer forms of the same evil. It may not involve the same economic or physical evils, but its moral effects are hardly less regrettable and sinister.'[1]

A recent writer, speaking of what he calls the 'city type' of the coming years, the 'street-bred' people of the twentieth century, says: 'In the past twenty-five years a force has been operating in the raw material of which the city is composed . . . The second generation of the immigrants has been reared in the courts and crowded ways of the great metropolis, with cramped physical accessories, hot, fretful life and long hours of sedentary or unhealthy toil. . . . We may say that it is physically, mentally, and spiritually different from the type characteristic of Englishmen during the past two hundred years. The physical change is the result of the city up-bringing in twice-breathed air in the crowded quarters of the labouring classes. This as a substitute for the spacious places

[1] C. Booth, *Life and Labour of the People*, vol. ix. p. 296. (1897.)

of the old, silent life of England ; close to the ground, vibrating to the lengthy, unhurried processes of nature. The result is the production of a characteristic *physical* type of town-dweller—stunted, narrow-chested, easily wearied, yet voluble, excitable, with little ballast, stamina, or endurance—seeking stimulus in drink, in betting, in any unaccustomed conflicts at home or abroad. Upon these city generations there has operated the now widely-spread influence of thirty years of elementary school teaching. The result is a *mental* change ; each individual has been endowed with the power of reading, and a certain dim and cloudy capacity for comprehending what he reads. Hence the vogue of the new sensational press, with its enormous circulation and baneful influence ; the perpetual demand of the reader for fiercer excitement from his papers.'

The same writer speaks as follows of the spiritual results of the present conditions of town life :—

'A change more vital and more ominous for the future is widely attested by those familiar with this new city type ; the almost universal decay, amongst these massed and unheeded populations, of any form of spiritual religion. Morally, indeed, they for the most part accept a standard which is the astonishment of their friends. Patience under misfortune, a persistent cheerfulness, family affection, and neighbourly helpfulness are widespread amongst them. But the spiritual world, whether in Nature, in Art, or in de-

finite Religion, has vanished, and the curtain of the horizon has descended round the material things and the pitiful duration of human life. In former time in England, for better or worse, the things of the earth were shot with spiritual significance ; heaven and hell stretched out as permanent realities ; the "kingdom of all the worlds" rose up as "the theatre of man's achievements" and "the measure of his destiny." To-day amongst the masses of our great towns God is faintly apprehended as an amiable but absentee ruler ; heaven and hell are passing to the memories of a far-off childhood, the one ceasing to attract, the other to alarm.'[1]

V

It has already been shown that rest is not the primary object of Sunday, that in the early days Christians rested mainly in order that they might have time for worship. We have also seen that, in respect of the Sabbath, the idea of rest had been developed at the expense of all else. The rabbinical doctors had practically reduced it to unreality. Our Lord's teaching lifts up their Sabbath idea to a higher level by setting forth the thought of God's rest in work and work in rest :—'My Father worketh hitherto,' He says, 'and I work.'[2] 'He is no more a breaker of the Sabbath than God is, when

[1] C. F. G. Masterman, *Heart of the Empire*, pp. 7-9.
[2] S. John v. 17.

He upholds with an energy that knows no pause the work of His creation from hour to hour, and from moment to moment:—"My Father worketh hitherto and I work"; My work is but the reflex of His work.' By this example of the divine method He teaches that 'abstinence from an outward work belongs not to the idea of a Sabbath; it is more or less a necessary condition of it for beings so framed and constituted as ever to be in danger of losing the true collection and rest of the spirit in the multiplicity of earthly toil and business. Man indeed must cease from *his* work, if a higher work is to find place in him. He scatters himself in his work, and therefore must collect himself anew, and have seasons for so doing. But with Him who is one with the Father it is otherwise. The deepest rest is not excluded by the highest activity; nay rather, they are one and the same,'[1] for He is the Eternal I AM with Whom work is rest and rest is energy; in the words of the old office hymn—

> 'While all things change at Thy decree,
> Thyself unchanged eternally.'

Man with his limitations and his littleness cannot yet combine work and rest, as do the saints in heaven, who 'rest from their labours' and yet whose 'works do follow them.'

There is no question of the duty of work. 'Six

[1] Trench, *Notes on the Miracles*, pp. 256, 257. (1846.)

days shalt thou labour and do all thy work'; God will have no drones:—'If any will not work neither let him eat.'[1] Work may differ greatly—one man's labour is manual, another's mental; one man's toilsome, another light; one may have to labour in the sweat of his brow to earn his daily bread, another in God's providence may have much leisure. The leisured man has no less than others his work to do; he is responsible for the way in which he uses the time and means which God has given him; his work may be by unselfish efforts to make other people's lives brighter and to add something to the sum total of happiness in the world. It must not be forgotten that he must rest in mind and body from his daily routine of self-improvement or enjoyment, in order to develop his spiritual nature and to take up his duties towards others. Leisure is a talent to be used; it has to be accounted for. The leisured man is bound to develop to the utmost the faculties, the gifts, the powers entrusted to him, for the glory of God and for the good of his neighbours.

Idleness is a vice, and brings with it utter weariness. 'Men's idleness is the most disagreeable state of existence, and both mind and body are continually making efforts to escape from it. . . . There are many tasks and occupations which a man is unwilling to perform, but let no one think that he is in love with idleness; he turns to something which is more

[1] 2 Thess. iii. 10.

agreeable to his inclination, and doubtless more suited to his nature; but he is not in love with idleness.'[1]

Rest is good or bad according as it has or has not the right purpose. There is no merit in rest merely as rest.[2] If it is the reward of toil and the preparation of the labourer for fresh and even better toil it can be nothing but good. There are many who imagine that they are doing a religious thing by staying in bed for the greater part of Sunday morning, or lounging through the day doing nothing. One is more than inclined to doubt whether the most wearying work would not be better than this, unless the staying in bed is an actual physical necessity.

Rest, as Hooker tells us, is not idleness (which is the renunciation of duty for fear of pain), but either the ceasing from a perfect work, or the passing to a higher labour;—the giving over a meaner labour, because a worthier and better is to be undertaken.[3]

VI

It will greatly help us in deciding some of the critical points that arise as to the manner of observing Sunday if we keep in view the distinction between a rest that is laudable and a rest that is vicious. True rest is re-creation—the recruiting of powers fatigued by use. There has been waste going on in

[1] George Borrow, *Lavengro*, chap. xiv.

[2] See Appendix A.

[3] Cf. *Ecclesiastical Polity*, v. lxx. 4.

the body, waste of nerve and tissue which must be repaired; there has been mental waste going on, the tired brain must be refreshed; there has been spiritual waste going on, the fret and stir of life wearing away the spiritual energy of the man, which also must be set right.

A clear distinction should be made between the man who is idle all the week, and the man who on week-days never gets a minute to himself; we shall allow to the latter what we should certainly deny to the former. Such considerations will help us in deciding what we ourselves may or may not do on Sunday. Clearly, if we can avoid it, we ought to do nothing which involves wear and tear of the same kind as on other days of the week. For instance, many conscientious women are exercised as to whether they are doing wrong if they do needlework or knitting on Sunday. Without any attempt here to discuss nice points of casuistry, it would seem reasonable to say that much turns on the question whether it is the ordinary work by which they get their living. To do the same things as on other days of the week, with the same end in view, leads to the secularising of life; whereas if a hard-worked woman, who gets no time in the week to do the little odds and ends of home-mending that must be done, sits down quietly to do them on a Sunday afternoon, not thereby in any way diminishing her Sunday duties, few would blame her. On the same principle, the man who is

reading for an examination would put the examination books away on Sunday, the tradesman would lock up his ledgers.[1]

The following words of Alexander Knox are to the point: 'I myself, I acknowledge, am not friendly to an actual sabbatising of Sunday. I wish it to be observed, not so as to coerce but so as to elevate; to be kept holy in newness of spirit, rather than in the oldness of the letter. Whatever, therefore, tends to expand and ennoble the mind, whether it be directly religious, or, in a more general sense, "true and venerable, just and pure, lovely, and of good report," strikes me to come properly (if it come proportionably) within the employments or the recreations of

[1] 'No trait in the tenor of my father's life was more constant and characteristic than his use of Sunday. So far as he rightly could, he kept the day from the encroachment of ordinary work. He did what had to be done: but he never lightened the burden of a week-day by deferring any of its demands till Sunday. There was a peculiar look of reluctance in the way he went to see a visitor who had come on that day when he might as well have come on another: and the visit was generally short. I remember asking him when I was an undergraduate whether I might on Sunday go on reading for the schools. I don't remember all his answer: but it was decisively negative; partly on the ground that a man was almost sure to break down if he would not rest one day in the week. And he used religiously the rest he so secured. He never dined out, never travelled for pleasure's sake, never read a newspaper or a novel on Sunday, never let any weariness stop his church-going.

'In the inscription beneath the window commemorating in St. Nicholas at Yarmouth his father and mother, he wrote of them as "lovers of their church and home": and to that twofold love, ever present in his life, he dedicated the time won from work on Sundays. . . .' *Memoirs and Letters of Sir James Paget*, edited by one of his sons, p. 421.

Sunday. But it is in S. Paul's sense of all things being pure to the pure that I say this. A fence must be drawn between Sunday and the world; between its businesses and the businesses of other common days, or piety will be shut out of human life.'[1]

Such a principle has its exceptions, as, for instance, when in a Swiss village church, on a fine Sunday, notice is given from the pulpit that, the weather having been bad in the week, work may be done in the hayfield on the Sunday afternoon. Those to whom reasonable latitude is allowed are only the more likely to observe a rule well.[2]

VII

It remains to consider the best manner of using the quiet thus secured. Due regard having been given to physical rest and public worship, the next duty will be to spend time at home in refreshing and recreating the mental and spiritual faculties. First comes Bible

[1] *Remains*, vol. iv. p. 347.

[2] See Appendix A, pp. 266, 267, and Appendix C, p. 270. Cf. Injunctions of Edward VI., issued in 1547, No. 24. . . . 'All parsons, vicars, and curates shall teach and declare unto their parishioners that they may with a safe and quiet conscience in ye time of harvest labour upon ye holy and festival days, and save that thing which God hath sent. And if from any scrupulosity, or grudge of conscience, men should superstitiously abstain from working upon those days, that then they should grievously offend and displease God.'—Cardwell, *Documentary Annals*, vol. i. p. 17. Cf. also 20th of Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions of 1559.—Cardwell, *Documentary Annals*, vol. i. p. 220; and Canon 13 of 1603.

reading. It has not ceased to be necessary that we should 'read, mark, learn and inwardly digest' the Holy Scriptures. The Englishman boasts of his 'open Bible,' he thanks God that he has it in the 'vulgar tongue,' but he sometimes reads it very little. Very likely he has never realised that some system, however simple, is necessary for reading and understanding the Bible. Perhaps he has never been advised as to what parts of Scripture to study; perhaps has never come across a good commentary, or learnt to read the Bible with what Bishop Westcott says is the best commentary of all, namely a Reference Bible or a Concordance,—'comparing spiritual things with spiritual.' Let any one who has not yet begun to read his Bible systematically, buy or borrow Dr. Liddon's *Advent Sermons*, read carefully through the one which deals with Bible-reading, and follow the advice there given. He will soon realise the truth of the words 'Thy word is a lantern unto my feet: and a light unto my path,' and say, 'O how sweet are thy words unto my throat: yea, sweeter than honey unto my mouth.' In the difficulties and temptations of daily life he will find the meaning of the saying, 'Thy words have I hid within my heart: that I should not sin against thee.'

Besides the Bible there are many other religious books which may be read with advantage. When once a man acquires a taste for good religious literature, his only difficulty will be to make the

best choice. The multiplicity of books nowadays constitutes a real peril. Thoroughly to master and make friends of a few select devotional books of the best kind, such as, *The Imitation of Christ*, *The Spiritual Combat*, Law's *Serious Call*, Bishop Wilson's *Sacra Privata*, or *The Christian Year*, is for most of us more profitable than anything else. Of good sermons also there is no lack. In the last few years there have been written several valuable books which, within a short compass, and in concise language, give an outline of the Christian faith such as many need. Our tendency is to be vague, invertebrate, and unsystematic in matters of faith, and also to forget that faith demands of us the exercise of our best powers. Such books as these assort and put into shape the truths which we already know, open out new vistas of knowledge in the things of God, and give religious truth a fresh interest.[1] Biographies too with their concrete facts are interesting to many who would be wearied by books dealing with abstract subjects. 'Dry precept and disembodied disquisition, as they can only be read with an effort of abstraction, can

[1] 'He got his time [on Sundays] for the study of theology: and he made the very most of it. Then, too, the rare strength and resoluteness of his mind came out. For no book seemed too stiff for him, if only it was thorough and well thought out and sincere. Pascal and Hooker he had studied thoroughly in early days: at one time he set himself to master Berkeley and Cudworth: he read much of Pusey, and Newman, and Liddon, and Lightfoot, and Westcott: and everything that Church and Mozley wrote. . . .'—*Life of Sir James Paget*, p. 422.

never convey a perfectly complete, or a perfectly natural impression. Truth, even in literature, must be clothed with flesh and blood, or it cannot tell its whole story to the reader. Hence . . . good biographies and works of high imaginative art are not only far more entertaining but far more edifying than books of theory or precept.'[1]

If quiet Sundays, carefully used in this way, taught men to think more systematically they would be of great value. Such studies would also lead them to make better use of other opportunities which the Church gives.

There is danger in these busy days of forgetting the paramount importance of personal character. We must not dissipate this, or risk the loss of the one supreme and abiding possession;—'What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?' What we do depends upon what we are; the value of service is in proportion to the force and reality of character.

NOTE

What is said above as to Sunday-reading is not intended to exclude the reading of light literature by those who need it as a mental rest.

[1] R. L. Stevenson, essay on 'Henry David Thoreau,' in *Men and Books*.

CHAPTER VIII

SERVICE

A THIRD obligation of Sunday is to do our duty to others:—'When the religious obligations of Sunday have been complied with there are duties of brotherhood, kind deeds and words to friends, visits to the sick above all. It should be made a bright as well as a solemn day for our children, so that in after life they may look back on the Sundays of childhood as the happiest of days.'[1]

It has been pointed out that we have an argument for Sunday observance likely to be widely accepted in what may be called the 'social need.' The recent defeat of the attempt to introduce a Sunday issue of some of the daily papers was a remarkable sign of the times: the attempt was baffled by the widespread feeling that to rob a large body of men of their Sunday rest was a selfish want of consideration running counter to the conscience of the age. There is every reason why we should appeal to the human instinct manifested in this incident, this wholesome

[1] Liddon, *Easter in S. Paul's*, sermon xxiv., on the 'Lord's Day.'

rebellion against a ceaseless grinding of the great social machine. In making this appeal to the social conscience we are taking a perfectly legitimate line; we do not always use to the drunkard S. Paul's argument, that he is defiling that body which is a member of Christ, a temple of the Holy Ghost. It is often well to begin on a lower level, and appeal to his pocket or his sense of what is due to his wife and family. We may do the same in our endeavour to stir the public conscience on the subject of Sunday rest; it must be shown that this is a social and not merely a religious question, and on this ground we may sometimes appeal, apart from all question of creed or religious motive, to men whose fundamental instincts are right, though their grasp of truth may be weak.

There are few things on which modern discoveries have thrown more light than the mysterious way in which our lives are linked together and the degree in which it is possible for one to influence the many; the 'solidarity' of human life has in our own day been emphasised to a remarkable degree. The eighteenth century and the early part of the nineteenth saw the recognition of the value of the individual; we are now learning that, important as the recognition of that value is, the individual cannot realise himself, or attain his end apart from others. This truth has a direct bearing on the subject of this volume, inasmuch as a line of action, though it may

be in no direct conflict with our personal duty to God or ourselves, yet may be wrong in that it affects the bodily or spiritual welfare of others.

I

The question of exercise or amusements on Sunday does affect the bodily and spiritual welfare of others, and must be dealt with on unselfish principles. The consideration of whether a particular form of exercise or a particular game involves labour or trouble to others is important; and the assurance that such games as golf, cricket, lawn-tennis, and croquet, or such indoor occupations as music or drawing, do not involve such labour will tend to set at rest the qualms of conscience which many people have. In many amusements we do not employ others at all, or need not do so. As regards golf, for instance, one would imagine that a little thought and consideration on the part of a club committee would set free at any rate the greater part of the staff on Sunday. Cricket too is a game which, on the ground that no labour is involved, may well be permitted. It is well known that Mr. Keble, in his country parish of Hursley, encouraged Sunday cricket: one who knew him very well and worked under him says that, when on one occasion there was a discussion as to the advisability of the Sunday cricket being abandoned in a parish where one of his old curates had introduced the

practice, Mr. Keble said, 'Don't be persuaded to give it up; I'm sure you are right.'[1]

Again, it is obvious that bicycling need involve no trouble to any one but ourselves.[2]

II

We pass on to the use of our spare time on Sunday in mental culture, a subject intimately connected with the question whether picture galleries and museums shall be opened on the Lord's Day or not.

Without attempting to do more than touch upon so wide a subject, it may be well to recall some words of Principal Shairp: 'Culture and religion are not, when rightly regarded, two opposite powers, but they are, as it were, one line with two opposite poles. Start from the manward pole and go along the line honestly and thoroughly and you land in the divine one. Start from the divine pole and carry out all that it implies and you land in the manward pole or the perfection of humanity. Ideally considered then, culture must culminate in religion, and religion must expand into culture.' Again, 'Culture proposes as its end the carrying of man's nature to its highest perfection, the developing to the full all the capacities of humanity. If then, in this view, humanity be contemplated in

[1] See Appendix B.

[2] Such amusements are here considered simply on their merits, without reference to the possibilities of wasted Sundays unhappily involved in them (see p. 106).

its totality, and not in some partial side of it, culture must aim at developing our humanity in its Godward aspect as well as its mundane aspect. And it must not only recognise the religious side of humanity, but if it tries to assign the due place to each capacity, and assign to all the capacities their mutual relations, it must concede to the Godward capacities that paramount and dominating place which rightfully belongs to them, if they are recognised at all. That is, culture must embrace religion and end in it.'[1]

The mental faculties of many are blunted by disuse or misuse. They have scarcely more power of appreciating beautiful things than an animal has of admiring a sunset;[2] there is nothing within to respond to the influence of the beauty without, no subjective power of assimilation; to them beautiful things are as though they were not. But those who believe in the capacities of man know that somewhere these faculties of response to the beautiful are lying dormant, and only need to be drawn out. It is no argument to say that if you have made people care about pictures, or the treasures of a museum, you have not necessarily made them better men and women. That is true, but you have led them along a road which opens out endless possibilities. It is impossible to account for that strange thrill which beautiful things—a piece of exquisite

[1] Shairp, *Culture and Religion*, pp. 14, 15.
[2] Cf. Mozley, *University Sermons*, second edition, p. 127.

music, a picture, or a sunset—give us, unless they have in them something which is divine, unless behind them is the Created Word, in whom all things cohere, who is the life of all that lives.[1] These works of God are frequently occasions of actual grace; and the attempt to educate men, to reveal to them the beauty of beautiful things, is a step in the Godward direction:—

'There is a book who runs may read,
Which heavenly truth imparts,
And all the lore its scholars need
Pure eyes and Christian hearts.

The works of God above, below,
Within us and around,
Are pages in that book, to show
How God Himself is found.'[2]

It is not easy to see why looking at good pictures or art treasures should not have the effect of bringing people nearer to God rather than of making them forget Him. The man whose own house is full of pictures would have no hesitation, however Sabbatarian his views might be, in showing the pictures to his friends on a Sunday afternoon; why should it be wrong for others to enjoy quietly the treasures of our public galleries? Obviously, if a visit to a gallery or museum is of such absorbing interest to a man as to lead him to neglect his duty

[1] Cf. S. John i. 3, R.V. margin ('*That which hath been made was life in him*'); cf. Col. i. 17, and Bishop Lightfoot's note on the passage.

[2] Keble, *Christian Year* (Septuagesima Sunday).

to God, it will be well for him to give up his visits. But, whatever difficulties may be involved, it is impossible not to feel that young men who live in solitary lodgings in a large town, or young women who have no friends, ought to have places to which they can go for reasonable relaxation, and that it is far better for them to use their leisure in this way than to be driven into questionable places of resort, or to loiter about the streets and get into bad company. Few people know how many servant girls are ruined by being obliged to take their regular 'Sunday out' and having no friends to whom they can go.

But this involves again the question of Sunday labour. Not more, however, than a very few attendants are as a rule required for the care of galleries on Sunday. It was suggested some years ago, though perhaps the suggestion has been forgotten, that Jews might act as warders, or that those who feel strongly the need of opening should volunteer to do so. Those who know the working classes best will testify that such attendants would have but little trouble. A visitor to the National Gallery on the day of the Trafalgar Square riots some years ago reported that, in the interval of waiting for the riots to begin, large numbers of intending rioters flocked into the Gallery and peacefully enjoyed the pictures. This incident shows the quiet and decorous spirit in which Londoners at any rate, even of the roughest class, can use

the galleries. It is hard to see what possibility of Sunday desecration there can be in throwing open these places to the public on the only day on which most of them can get the opportunity to enjoy them.[1]

III

It is in reference to domestic servants that the principle of thoughtful consideration applies most largely. 'I wish I could get a cook without a soul' was the utterance of a materfamilias many years ago. Even good men and women are often strangely careless about the spiritual needs of those who work for them, forgetting that a little thought as to the hour at which they wish to be called, the arrangement of meals or the use of carriages and horses would often make religious observances possible for their servants. In nothing does this thoughtlessness work more damage than in the matter of excessive Sunday hospitality;[2] when the household is kept at work all day there is little chance for its members to get to church, or to secure any of that quiet which servants ought to have.

If again servants are kept up late on Saturday nights they cannot get to their Communions, as they ought to do, on Sunday mornings.

We need to exercise more consideration in these matters; they are not trivial; they are covered by

[1] Cf. Liddon, *Easter in S. Paul's*, serm. xxiv. [2] See Appendix H.

the Apostolic precept to 'bear one another's burdens' and to 'look each of you also to the things of others.' Want of thought may amount to a great sin, as it did in the case of the rich man, to whom it never occurred even to think of Lazarus lying at his gate.

That this warning does not refer only to the servants in our own households should be remembered by those who spend Sunday in the country. The modern custom of 'week-end' holidays is ruinous to the Sunday quiet of many a country house.

If the case is so with domestic servants, it is even more true of servants in the London clubs. The fact that, in spite of low wages, and long inconvenient hours, they are a cheerful and courageous set of men, ought to dispose those with whom the responsibility lies to do all they can to help them. That they should have 'Sundays off' or shorter hours on that day may need arrangement, but it could surely be managed.[1]

There are certain matters, such as the interests of railway and hotel servants, omnibus drivers or cabmen, which involve too many complicated questions to be entered into here in detail, but which could be solved if sound principles were honestly applied.[2]

The question of open shops on Sunday need only

[1] It might, for instance, be possible, one would think, to avoid playing billiards far into the small hours of Sunday morning.

[2] On one Sunday in June, three years ago, the Sunday League ran no less than twenty-three special excursion trains from London to Portsmouth, carrying fourteen thousand passengers.

be alluded to; it is still a practical matter in the poorer districts of London, though in the last fifteen or twenty years the state of things has improved.

The following words, written by the Paris correspondent of *The Times* a year or two ago, show that in France the feeling in favour of closing shops on Sundays is a strong one:—

'As readers of *The Times* are aware, this is the Feast of the Assumption, one of the four great Concordat festivals celebrated in France, which are observed as holidays in the Government offices and by the public in general. The Courts are idle, the workshops empty, the streets and boulevards deserted. Several of the newspapers do not appear, and most of the shops are closed. I ought to add that this custom of closing the shops, which has become general to-day, and which gives that dominical aspect which foreigners who spend Sunday in London complain of, is really an English importation, and one for which the French ought to be very grateful. I have often asked Parisian shopkeepers if this rest was prejudicial to them, but all have replied that it was a great benefit to their health, and that those tradesmen who originally refused to follow the example had ended by acting like the others. They closed their shops because they had no customers. And, in fact, if the shopkeepers need a rest, their customers also need one day in the week, and husbands, besides, are not sorry if their wives

give a day's rest to their pockets. For these reasons this example taken from England is a moral and material benefit for France.'[1]

Evidently our neighbours are casting envious eyes at that which we are in peril of losing.[2]

III

The principle that our neighbour has a claim to thoughtful consideration, has further applications of an equally practical kind. The solidarity of mankind makes the law of unselfishness a far-reaching one; we have, for instance, on Sundays to refrain for the sake of others from many things which yet are right in themselves. Many things are right which it is not right for us to do. 'All things are lawful; but all things are not expedient,'[3] because others may misunderstand our action, and be led by our example into doing what for them is wrong. It was on this principle that S. Paul said, 'Wherefore, if meat maketh my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh for evermore, that I make not my brother to stumble.'[4]

These words recall to our minds the solemn warning in which our Lord speaks of this sin of giving

[1] *The Times*, Aug. 16, 1899.

[2] In the Lent of 1898 the Pope commanded the parochial clergy to preach on the observance of Sunday, and to tell the people (1) not to begin any work on Saturday that would have to be completed on Sunday; (2) not to shop on Sunday; (3) not to deal with shops that opened on Sunday.

[3] 1 Cor. x. 23.

[4] 1 Cor. viii. 13.

'scandal,' of putting stumbling blocks in the way of his 'little ones'—not only, that is, those who are literally children, but those who are children in understanding and realise but little of Christian liberty. 'Whosoever shall cause one of these little ones that believe on me to stumble, it were better for him if a great millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea.'[1]

Not only then the direct burden of work that we may lay on others, but also their conscientious scruples must be considered in deciding what we may or may not do. 'Let each (seek) his neighbour's good.'[2] We may be perfectly sure that we interfere with no one by playing cards or billiards, or outdoor games which involve no labour on Sunday, and may defend both practices on that ground; but we cannot be equally sure that we are not lowering the standard of others by our example.

Consciences are delicate things to tamper with, and though it is quite true that there is a point beyond which we have no right to go in giving up our Christian liberty, we can scarcely be too careful lest we wound weak souls.[3] It must be remembered that those whose consciences are uneducated or weakened by sin have little perception of the finer distinctions between right and wrong. It may be quite clear to you that certain things belong to your Christian liberty, but the prejudices which prevent those others

[1] S. Mark ix. 42. [2] 1 Cor. x. 24. [3] See Appendix B.

from using such liberty themselves or appreciating your liberty are, for a time at least, a necessary prop to their Christian life, which you must be careful not to remove. This principle also covers the question of any legislation by the Church or combined public action on such matters. Any abrupt removal of fences, any hasty action would be fatal, and tend to destroy the authority of conscience, and the sense of right and wrong.

At the same time it is a matter of regret that men when they begin to be really in earnest sometimes take too rigid a Sabbatarian line.

An old man, who died some years ago, for thirteen years had never bought bread or read a newspaper on a Monday. He knew, or thought he knew, that the bread had been baked and the paper printed on Sunday evening, and at extreme inconvenience to himself had kept this rigid rule in the most conscientious manner possible.

Another old man who was being prepared for Confirmation had for years eked out his tiny livelihood by selling papers on a Sunday morning. He greatly wished to be confirmed, but at the same time knew that he could not conscientiously come forward while he was doing anything that he thought to be wrong. It was a difficult case for his adviser, who saw the dilemma clearly, and dared not make things too easy, lest he should destroy all reverence for Sunday, and weaken a not too enlightened conscience. The

ultimate solution was that a small job was found for him which enabled him to give up other work.

The action of these men interfered in no way with the Christian liberty of others. When however such scruples take the form of uncharitableness they may need severe condemnation.

IV

So far we have dealt with the principle of unselfishness on the negative side, but it has its positive side also. Our duty to our neighbour means more than abstention from doing him harm. 'The question which directs the activity of life is not, what can I get for myself, but what can I do for my fellows.'[1]

There is one way in which we must help others on Sundays too important to be omitted, and yet too obvious to need much emphasising, namely, almsgiving. Hooker speaks of 'a charitable largeness of more than common bounty' being one of the ways in which 'festival times' should be hallowed. And again he says, 'the first effect of joyfulness is to rest, because it seeketh no more; the next, because it aboundeth, to give. The root of both is the glorious presence of that joy which ariseth from the manifold considerations of God's unspeakable mercy, into which considerations we are led by occasion of

[1] Westcott, *Lessons from Work*, p. 253.

sacred times.[1]' Nowadays, happily, there are comparatively few churches in which we are allowed to forget the duty of almsgiving on Sunday, for at least a weekly collection at the offertory or at other services has become common. Why should we more than the Jews appear before God empty?[2] It is well to remember how high is the sanction for this custom of Sunday almsgiving. S. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians says, 'Upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store, as he may prosper, that no collections be made when I come.'[3]

The habit of 'bounty,' as Hooker calls it, will keep us not only from forgetting this aspect of service, but from letting it become careless, unreal, or unsystematic. 'We plead that that which is given to God should be a first charge upon our means, and set apart as sacred, and not be found in some chance fragments that remain when every other claim has been met, and every fancy gratified. We should not, I believe, find ourselves poorer if we were to place a part of our goods beyond the reach of fortune. I do not fancy that the widow who cast into the treasury of God all the living that she had felt afterwards that she had suffered any loss.'[4]

Almsgiving, however, is only one of many ways

[1] Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. lxx. 2, lxxi. 10. [2] Cf. Exod. xxiii. 15.
[3] 1 Cor. xvi. 2.
[4] Westcott, *The Incarnation and Common Life*, p. 202.

of service. A successful schoolmaster writes: 'I try to get my boys to think a little of other people, and to see the reason for not spending Sunday as other days, in various details. It seems to me that one great reason of both Godless and selfish Sundays lies in the absence of any feeling of vocation, and this is largely due to the want of teaching straight from the pulpit in parish churches (at Confirmation times), and at public and other schools. Of course there is a great lack of self-denial, but I believe this is more apparent than real. It does not strike boys that they ought to be doing something for their neighbour on Sunday; that something ought to be done to rescue the day from mere selfish leisure. I cannot see how if, at Confirmation and after, most of the advice is about the individual life, and about regular Communions and churchgoing, there is not a great danger of the *social* claims on all Christians, on Sunday especially, falling out, and indeed never being (as surely they should be) prominently brought before the young men and women of all classes. . . . Surely we owe God a portion of our time as well as our money. But the point that this is so, and that this time should be in some way spent for our neighbour, and not only for ourselves, has never been brought home in any real way to most of those whose unsatisfactory Sundays we deplore.'

This letter deals with a point which has received far too little attention from those who are trying to

promote a better observance of the Lord's Day, namely, the positive duty of recognising that others have a claim on our time and trouble on that day; it carries us on to the thought of active service on Sunday.

It may well be that the nature of their every-day employment, and the wear and tear of work, render it practically impossible for some to do anything which necessitates strain of mind or body. It seems unfair to expect those who are teaching all the week to take a class in a Sunday school, or to deprive those whose daily labour keeps them indoors of needful fresh air on their one free day.

Yet there are many who are hampered by no such difficulties, and to whom the self-denial involved in doing useful work for others on Sunday would be valuable. Many a Sunday school in town and country is languishing for want of competent teachers; many a class of elder boys or girls might be organised, were there an efficient person to take it in hand; the life of many an invalid might be brightened by a visit from one who now perhaps finds it difficult to kill time; many a servant girl might be saved from a moral downfall if only ladies of the right sort would have bright cheerful club-rooms open, with music and amusements, for those who have long 'Sundays out' but no friends or relations to whom they can go. As the letter above quoted suggests, the neglect of these things often springs from people failing to realise that they are a duty. We pray to God in one of our

collects 'that every member of the same [the Church] in his vocation and ministry may truly and godly serve' Him; we pray in the Holy Communion Service that we may 'do all such good works' as God 'has prepared for us to walk in'; but we forget that such work has an actual claim on us, that it cannot be accepted or left at pleasure.

The clergy are often expected to do everything themselves, and to be able to get through it all. Even if it were possible, it would be undesirable and wrong in principle; for the work of the Church is the work not of the clergy alone, but of the whole Body. Watch a man who is doing a difficult and delicate piece of work: not only his fingers are employed, though they alone may touch the work, but the whole man is engaged —his brain as well as his hand; and so it is in the Body of Christ, the Church; the work is the work of the whole Body, though only a few seem actually to touch it. A fuller recognition of the true position of the clergy would lead to a sounder view of the work of the laity. The more it is recognised that the whole Body is priestly in its nature owing to its union with the great High Priest, and that the clergy, called by God to the ministerial priesthood, gather up and express that which belongs to the whole, the more will the laity learn that the actual work of the Church cannot be left to them alone. It is theirs to guide and govern as well as to work, but they cannot do these things rightly or adequately if the laity do

not take their share. No doubt it is true that the failure to realise this is largely due to the fact that our boys in private and public schools and in our universities are seldom taught that they have a 'vocation and ministry' to fulfil—that our Lord has given 'to every man his work.' Things are better than they were thirty years ago, when there were none of those Public-School or College missions in our great towns which have done so much to rouse the interest of the young in work amongst the poor; but even now the teaching on the subject is meagre, and it is to be wished that more schoolmasters took the same view of their responsibility as is taken by the writer of the letter above quoted.

It is in large town parishes that the need of the laity fully realising their vocation is most felt. In recent years, owing to causes which cannot here be dealt with, the parochial system has, to a great extent, given way to the congregational. Many who, for one reason or another, cannot or do not attend their own parish church, establish themselves as regular members of some distant and possibly poor congregation. Those who do this should remember that the church in which they worship has a very special claim, not only on their sympathy, prayers, and alms, but also on their energies, and that they ought, so far as they are able, to aid in the good works carried on there. Unless this practice becomes more common, there will be increasing danger that churches planted

in the heart of a poor population will become fashionable resorts, and that the clergy, content to see a full church, should be too little anxious about gathering in those who obviously have the first claim upon their labours—the poor for whom the church was built, and to whom the Gospel must first be preached. We may find a mystical meaning in the words 'Ye shall not see my face except your brother be with you.'[1]

One warning seems necessary before we leave this subject. There is a danger that we should fall into a habit of thinking that all the real work lies outside our own doors, and overlook the 'thing that 's nearest.' For many even their whole service, or by far the greater part of it, lies within the four walls of their own home. One who has written much on girls and their education says, 'I know some matrons who have a lurking feeling that they are somehow a disgrace to their sex—deserters in the great battle—because they *merely* make a happy home for their husbands and children, and do the small neighbourly kindnesses which come in their way, but have no time or strength for more. I know girls, also, who chafe under this same sense of inferiority because they are only making their own home happy and improving their own mind; their time is "filled with odds and ends while a great work in the world wants doing." They refuse to be comforted by any suggestion that a great part of the world's work consists of these very odds

[1] Gen. xliii. 3.

and ends, and that somebody must see to them; that work in a London settlement is, after all, only odds and ends, though in other people's houses instead of their own; and that, as part of their "slumming" work would be to listen to old women's complaints, their own mother might be taken as an old woman in the abstract and listened to, as George Herbert listened to the old woman at Bemerton, "because it was some relief to a poor body to be but heard with patience." . . . Home is a sphere that requires more saintliness, more self-discipline, than the easy task of any definite outside work, such as a profession. The latter may be hard work, but it will still be, in a sense, self-indulgence, because it gives free scope to secondary motives, to the love of excitement and of power, to the thirst for activity and praise, which belong, if not to our lower nature, yet certainly not to our highest. It takes the highest nature a girl has to live a home life beautifully, strongly, graciously, completely. It is surely to be regretted that so many of the most noble and eloquent women of the day, in urging on girls the outside needs of the world, speak as if these alone called for self-devotion.'[1]

We have continually to remind ourselves of the value of the home opportunities, of the fact that the importance of actions lies not in what is external, but in the spirit with which they are done. 'The true art of life is to learn to look at it with God's

[1] Lucy H. M. Soulsby, *Stray Thoughts on Character*, pp. 86 ff.

eyes. To do the little things in a great spirit, to use little opportunities for a great end, this is the way of greatness. . . . In the Kingdom of God it is greatness of spirit not greatness of opportunity that ennobles.'[1] This principle will often be a guide as to the best use to make of Sundays. To be pleasant and agreeable at home is a good work, to play music for old people, making their day brighter or shorter, to have a 'good talk,' even a mere gossip, with the lonely, the worried, or even with the perfectly ordinary commonplace person, to make the children's time pass pleasantly—all these things may be works of genuine philanthropy, all the more valuable because there is nothing heroic or exciting about them, nothing for which one gets credit, and perhaps all the more acceptable because on other days home life gets thrust into a corner. Many a busy man in these days sees but little of his wife and children, and when he is with them is too tired to give them of his best; it is unfair to them that on the one day when he can be with them his energies should still be spent outside his home. A common saying, too often misapplied, is that 'charity begins at home,' but in this case it has its most obvious application. Sunday should be a home day, a day for showing 'piety at home,' a day on which family ties should be paramount so long as they are duly co-ordinated with other claims.

[1] Lang, *Miracles of Jesus*, p. 151.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSION

It remains to sum up briefly the results arrived at in the preceding pages. We have seen that within the last few years great changes have taken place in England as to the manner in which Sunday is observed. The changes seem at first sight to point to a widespread abandonment of old restraints and religious practices; but side by side with much that is discouraging there is ground for hopefulness. In spite of the absence of clear principles, which causes many to drift from the old moorings, a strong feeling has arisen and is gaining ground, that a time has come when we can begin to act on clear and definite lines.

It is, moreover, safe to say that to take a pessimistic view of the situation, and give way to lamentations, is of all courses the one least likely to be effective. It cannot be denied that much of the flinging off of restraints which distresses us has its good side. It looks like rebellion and self-will, and to a certain extent no doubt is so; but when we

consider that the positive injunctions which in past years people thought it necessary to obey were not seldom of a wearisome and unreasonable nature, we come to the conclusion that it has been at least in great part a rebellion against unwise restraints. To discover the real causes of the evil, and the best manner of dealing with it, we must go back to the lessons of history.

The study of history, briefly set out in this volume, has led us to set aside the idea of the identity of Sunday with the Jewish Sabbath. Even a slight knowledge of the manner in which the observance of the first day of the week actually grew up, side by side with that of the seventh, would make it impossible to accept that view. That in modern, or comparatively modern, times confusion should have arisen is intelligible, but that it should have existed in the first ages of the Christian Church is a moral impossibility.

How far our Lord may have Himself, during the Great Forty Days, instructed the disciples as to the observance of the day, or how far it was settled and arranged by any definite Apostolic ordinance we do not know. Only the fact of its observance from the very earliest ages of the Church is certain, and it appears to have been a natural outcome of the joyous faith of the early Christians in their Risen Lord.

As centuries rolled by, it was natural for Sabbatarian associations to creep in; for Old Testament sanction

to be sought; and the shield of the Fourth Commandment to be thrown over the obligation of Sunday.

So long as the distinction between the two institutions is kept perfectly clear, there is no reason for regretting this. The principle[1] of the consecration of a portion of our time holds good now as of old. We have, of course, to guard ourselves against allowing it to become a mere external regulation, and must never forget that our Lord makes a personal claim on our devotion and allegiance, sanctifying human lives, and using those whom He thus sanctifies for the promotion of His kingdom and for the glory of God.

This principle we must steadily endeavour to keep in view; it is peculiarly fitted to meet the characteristic needs of our own time. The age is a material one; men and women are unduly absorbed in outward things.

This material spirit, worship rightly understood and faithfully practised will tend to counteract. The age is an unduly busy one; over-activity is the fashionable vice; restlessness penetrates even where there is little to be done; and as a result many lives remain stunted and undeveloped. This the quiet of Sunday should remedy. There is a vigorous social conscience growing up, a spirit of philanthropy, a real even if sometimes a half-instructed desire to promote the Kingdom of God. An unselfish thoughtful use of Sunday, with due recognition of the work

[1] See p. 35.

that can be done by the laity, will help to guide such energy into right channels.

We may be prepared to find that a Sunday such as this will meet with a large measure of welcome. However much the conscience of the community needs to be further aroused and enlightened on the subject, it is certainly true that there exist a desire for a fuller development of a higher life, and a weariness of merely material aims.

It must be made perfectly clear that what we are striving after tends in this direction; that the Sunday we wish men to take into their lives is not an external obligation, imposed by an unmeaning authority, but one founded on principles which appeal to all that is most reasonable in man's nature; that in being asked to accept this they are treated not as children, but as responsible beings; and our appeal will not be made in vain. A Sunday full of the freedom and joy of the Resurrection life, yet containing the Old Testament principle of the consecration of our time to God, a Sunday tending to the full development of life, enabling man to fulfil his duty to God, himself, and his neighbour, ought to appeal to all that is best in the men and women of to-day.

One special reason why those who have moral questions at heart should desire greater strictness in this matter is, that in our own day there has been a great relaxation of discipline. Few members of the

Church observe even the plainest and most elementary of the Church's rules. The old stern severity of Puritan times has gone, while the joy and the freedom of Catholic obedience have been but imperfectly grasped. The position is full of peril. Obedience is of the very essence of religion, disobedience is the essence of sin:[1]—'As through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous.'[2] The life of our Lord on earth was one long act of unswerving obedience to the Father's will:—'My meat,' He said, 'is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work';[3]—'I do always the things that are pleasing to him' . . . and at the last, I have 'accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do.'[4] The same spirit of obedience must mark the lives of all who belong to Christ. Every priest of the English Church when he is ordained is asked, 'Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same?' and answers, 'I will.' Each year, as Ash Wednesday comes round, and the Commination Service is read, we are reminded of the 'godly discipline' of the Primitive Church, and of the revisers'

[1] See Gen. iii. 1-6; 1 S. John iii. 4, 'Sin is lawlessness.'
[2] Rom. v. 19. [3] S. John iv. 34. [4] S. John viii. 29, xvii. 4.

wish that it might be restored. In the exhortation which follows we are bidden to 'submit ourselves unto [Christ] and from henceforth walk in His ways . . . take His easy yoke and light burden upon us, to . . . be ordered by the governance of His Holy Spirit.' An old writer of the early seventeenth century says, 'Christ so pardons us as He will be obeyed as a King; He so taketh us to be His spouse as He will be obeyed as a husband; the same Spirit that convinceth us of the necessity of His righteousness to cover us convinceth us also of the necessity of His government to rule us.'[1]

Few will be found to deny that the spirit of obedience is greatly lacking amongst us; that no virtue is less popular. It may be that in this as in other things we are passing through a period of reaction, that we are feeling the result of the exaggerated discipline of a generation or two back, when children were treated with Spartan rigour, when boys called their fathers 'sir,' when children were 'seen and not heard,' and when disobedience was hardly possible. Then 'to cry for a thing' meant not to have it; to talk about food at dinner, or to refuse what was given, was as impossible as to join in or interrupt the elders' conversation. For better or worse we have changed all that; there is far less formality, perhaps more sympathy, certainly more show of affection between parent and child; but however good these

[1] Richard Sibbes, *The Bruised Reed*, ch. xix.

things may be, they cannot be wholesome or form a good basis for the building up of character, unless side by side with them self-control, discipline, and obedience are learnt.

'There is always the danger—never more obvious than at the present time — of too much affection and too little authority. Affection is allowed to degenerate into indulgence. In the softness of the times, children are petted and humoured, and allowed a familiar way of speech and behaviour towards their parents which would have shocked a sterner age. There are few truths which are in greater need of assertion than that mere affection is positively harmful unless it is blended with authority. Two qualities are essential to the equipment of strong character—respect and obedience; and they are qualities singularly lacking in the present day. The lack of them is largely due to the increasing laxity of the element of authority in our homes. Trust, respect, deference, rendering honour to whom honour is due, we all complain of the want of these, of the absence of their old signs, of the impudence and familiarity of the young in the treatment of their elders and betters. But is not one source of the evil the habits of home life? Children are educated in the virtues not by theories but by habits; they will become deferential in character only if they are trained to observe the outward signs of deference in speech and manner. Can we then view without misgiving the ease and

familiarity with which children are allowed to speak to their parents — the primary representatives of authority?'[1]

We are reaping the fruits of this wide neglect of discipline in the general throwing off, by the present generation, of all restraints on the Lord's Day. It is impossible to deny that 'as I like' is the motto of very many; it finds its exemplification in the way in which they behave on Sunday; the liberal and generous character of its observance is absent. There is none of King David's spirit—'Neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the Lord my God which cost me nothing.'[2] That which it is the fashion to do, that which requires no effort, is done; there is no sense of rule to be obeyed, of 'duty' due to God, little genuine effort to stand firm when others are careless and lax, or to uphold principles in the midst of unsympathetic surroundings. Many a 'difficulty' as to what we may or may not do on Sunday would be solved if we were true to conscience. Many can look back on Sundays spoilt by disobedience to conscience —by the walk when conscience told them to go to church, or the game of cards joined in because there was not the courage to stand out. Loyal obedience to conscience at all hazards brings a strength and peace which nothing else can give.

S. Paul uses a remarkable phrase when in writing to the Romans he says, 'Thanks be to God that,

[1] Lang, *Miracles of Jesus*, p. 127. [2] 2 Sam. xxiv. 24

whereas ye were servants of sin, ye became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching whereunto ye were delivered.'[1] 'This suggests the idea of the Church as holding a pattern of sound words; a definite body of instruction, a mould which is to form the life of each person who gives himself over to her loving discipline. Christian faith is not a formless impulse; it is self-surrender to a corporate life ruled on a definite model of religion and moral teaching.'[2] It is the loss of this discipline of the Christian Church, made actual and real in the atmosphere of the family, from which we are now suffering. When the tender and loving pressure of a home life, based on definitely Christian principle, is brought to bear on children from their earliest years, they grow up in an atmosphere of simple and natural obedience which is easily retained through life. But many homes unhappily exist in which there is no such atmosphere. A little boy not long ago went to stay with some friends. When he came home his mother, asking him about his visit, said, 'What did you do on Sunday?' He could not remember at first; then he had a bright idea. 'Oh, we didn't have a Sunday there.'

We want to get back the quiet, effective pressure of a definite rule. We must try to teach children from their earliest years that on Sunday certain things are obligatory, and that their being done

[1] Rom. vi. 17. [2] Gore, *Romans*, vol. i. p. 234.

cannot be allowed to depend on chance. Nor need we be unduly afraid of rules. If children are taught from the first the supreme claim of Almighty God upon their lives, that they are not their own but are bought with a price, that therefore they owe certain duties to Him, there will be little fear of religious obligations becoming unreal, or merely external. It is only when regulations are enforced unintelligently and without love that they are irksome or enfeebling to the character.

There is no doubt that the failure of the children of the last generation or two to learn self-control has had much to do with the laxity which we lament. It is equally true that the restoration of true ideas about Sunday, and of the sense of claim and obligation, will help in restoring that discipline, the lack of which is so widely lamented on every side. Patience, wisdom, and much prayer are needed, for it is impossible that we can stem the tide all at once. Those who as parents, masters, or pastors have responsibilities in the matter need a clear grasp of the principles involved.

We shall never win patience unless we bear in mind the power and fruitfulness which spring from discipline. Those words of our Lord, spoken before His Passion, are as true to-day as ever, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but if it die, it beareth much fruit.'[1] It is only the life which has in it the

[1] S. John xii. 24.

element of sacrifice which can be a power in the world. Loose and slipshod lives, such as are too common amongst us now, will fail under a strain and never prove fruitful for good.

'Was there nought better than to enjoy?
No feat which, done, would make time break,
And let us pent-up creatures through
Into eternity, our due?
No forcing earth teach heaven's employ?

No wise beginning here and now,
What cannot grow complete (earth's feat)
And heaven must finish, there and then?
No tasting earth's true food for men,
Its sweet in sad, its sad in sweet?'[1]

Supposing that we gain this discipline, we shall not have lost, rather we shall have won joyousness. It is not the lax, ungoverned life which is joyous, but the strong and self-controlled. Cheerfulness is in no way incompatible with a disciplined or regulated life; in fact without discipline it is impossible to secure the 'verve' and energy which are essential to cheerfulness. An ill-regulated life lacks the necessary element of gladness; many a life lived in a whirl of gaiety and dissipation has lost all power of real joy; a 'blasé' weariness has taken possession, and only the wholesome, bracing discipline of rule can banish it.

Discipline and joy must go hand in hand;[2] and if

[1] Browning, '*Dîs aliter visum.*'

[2] If the days of fasting and abstinence prescribed by the Prayer Book were more generally observed by English Church people as days of genuine self-denial, it would lead to a fuller recognition of the brightness and joy of Sunday.

we omit the joy we shall be missing the very meaning of that day which was to the early Christians the spontaneous outcome of their intense faith in their Risen Lord.

'Serve and be chearefull' is Bishop Hacket's motto, given in one of the windows at Lichfield Cathedral; the words would be good to remember on Sundays.

Sunday is a festival, a weekly Easter, a day of joy and gladness; 'This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it'; like Christmas Day it can never be a fast.[1]

'Welcome, sweet day, of days the best,
The time of holy mirth and rest,
When to God's house the saints repair
To hear His Word and see His face,
To learn His will and sing His grace,
And vent their hearts in praise and prayer.

This day was by our Lord ordained,
That thus His servants might be trained
For heavenly work and heavenly joy:
My soul, be this thy day of rest,
And thus prepare thee to be blest,
Thus all thy holy hours employ.'[2]

Especially we cannot be too careful that children shall never associate Sunday with gloom; nor can we take too much pains to make it a day to which they shall look forward. If Sunday is a sad day to them, when the time of freedom comes Sunday restraints will be thrown off; they will disappear out of their lives with the toys and the lesson books.

[1] Appendix B; Appendix F.
[2] Simon Browne, 1720, *The Lord's Day*.

We are too apt to speak contemptuously of the 'Continental Sunday,' but it may be partly because we do not know how real a place worship has in it, and partly because we are not wholly in sympathy with a bright cheerful lightheartedness which is not altogether natural to ourselves. Our English tradition is probably a safer basis to build on than that of the continental nations; let us hope so; but we must take care that we regain the spirit of worship which they have to a great extent retained, and that we cast off the heavy atmosphere which has deprived our own Sunday of that brightness and joy which should be an integral part of it.

It may be that the view taken in this book will be looked upon as unpractical. That it is to a great extent an ideal the writer is fully prepared to admit. But he thinks that he need not apologise for holding up a high ideal, for he believes that 'ideals are the soul of life.'[1]

[1] Bishop Westcott, *The Incarnation and Common Life*, p. 143.

APPENDIX A.

'THE KING'S BOOK,' 1543.

The Exposition of the Fourth Commandment of God

'Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day.'

'As touching this commandment, it is to be noted, that this word *sabbote* is an Hebrew word, and signifieth in English rest; so that the sabbath day is as much to say as the day of rest and quietness. And there is specially a notable difference between this commandment and the other nine commandments. For, as S. Austin saith, all the other nine be merely moral commandments, and belonged not only to the Jews, and all other people of the world in the time of the Old Testament, but also belong now to all Christian people in the New Testament. But this precept of the sabbath, as concerning rest from bodily labour the seventh day, is ceremonial, and pertained only unto the Jews in the Old Testament, before the coming of Christ, and pertaineth not unto us Christian people in the New Testament. Nevertheless as concerning the spiritual rest which is figured and signified by this corporal rest, that is to say, rest from the carnal works of the flesh, and all manner of sin, this precept is moral and remaineth still, and bindeth them that belong to Christ; and not for every seventh day only, but for all days, hours and times. For at all times are we bound to rest from fulfilling of our own carnal will and pleasure, and from all sins and evil desires, from pride, disobedience, ire, hate, covetousness, and all such corrupt and carnal appetites, and to commit ourselves wholly unto God, that he may work in us all things that be to his will and pleasure. And this is the true sabbath or rest of us that be christened, when we rest from our own

carnal wills, and be not led thereby, but be guided by God and His Holy Spirit. And this is the thing that we pray for in the Paternoster, when we say, Father, let thy kingdom come to us. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Reign thou in us. Make that we may do thy will, and from our corrupt will may we rest and cease. And for this purpose God hath ordained fast, watch and labour, to the end that by these and such other exercises we might mortify and kill the evil and sinful desires of the flesh, and attain this spiritual rest and quietness which is figured and signified in this commandment.

'Furthermore, besides this spiritual rest, which chiefly and principally is required of us, we be bound by this precept at certain times to cease from bodily labour and to give our minds entirely and wholly unto God, to hear the divine service approved, used and observed in the church, and also the word of God, to acknowledge our own sinfulness unto God, and his great mercy and goodness unto us, to give thanks unto him for his benefits, to make public and common prayer for all things needful, to visit the sick, to instruct every man his children and family in virtue and goodness, and such other like works. Which things, although all Christian people be bound unto by this commandment, yet the sabbath day, which is called the Saturday, is not now prescribed and appointed thereunto, as it was to the Jews; but instead of the sabbath day succeedeth the Sunday, in memory of Christ's resurrection. And also many other holy and festival days, which the church hath ordained from time to time, which be called holy days, not because that one day is more acceptable to God than another, or of itself more holy than another, but because the church hath ordained that upon those days we should give ourselves wholly, without any impediment, unto such holy works as be before expressed, whereas upon other days we may do and apply ourselves to bodily labour, and be thereby much letted from such holy and spiritual works.

'And to the intent, the ignorant people may be the more clearly instructed what holy and spiritual works they ought to do upon the holy day, here followeth a brief declaration thereof. First, let them make an account with themselves how they have bestowed the week past, remembering what evil minds and par-

poses they have had, what words they have spoken, what things they have done or left undone, to the dishonour and displeasure of God, and to the hurt of their neighbour, and what example or occasion of evil they have given unto other. And when they have thus recollected and considered all these things in their minds, than let them humbly knowledge their faults unto God, and ask forgiveness for the same, with unfeigned purpose in their hearts to convert and return from their naughty lives, and to amend the same; and let them also clearly and purely in their hearts remit and forgive all malice and displeasure which they bear to any creature. Then let them fall into prayer, according to the commandment of Christ, where he saith, When you begin to pray, forgive whatsoever displeasure you have against any man. And when they be weary of prayer, then let them use reading of the word of God, or some other good or heavenly doctrine, so that they do it quietly, without disturbance of other that be in the church; or else let them occupy their minds with wholesome and godly meditations, whereby they may be the better; and they that can read may be well occupied upon the holy day, if, in time and place convenient, they read soberly and quietly unto other, such as they have charge of, such good books as be allowed, which may be unto them instead of a sermon; for all things that edify man's soul in our Lord God be good and wholesome sermons.

'And truly if men would occupy themselves upon the holy days and spend the same days holily after this form and manner, not only in the house of God, but also in their own houses, they should eschew thereby much vice, confound their ancient enemy the Devil, much edify both themselves and other, and finally attain much grace and high reward of Almighty God.

'Also men must have special regard that they be not over scrupulous or rather superstitious in abstaining from bodily labour upon the holy day. For notwithstanding all that is afore spoken, it is not meant but we may upon the holy day give ourselves to labour for the speedy performance of the necessary affairs of the prince and commonwealth, at the commandment of them that have rule and authority therein. And also in all other times of necessity, as for saving of our corn and cattle, when it is like to be in danger, or like to be destroyed, if

remedy be not had in time. For this lesson our Saviour teaches us in the gospel ; and we need not to have any scruple or grudge in conscience, in such case of necessity, to labour on the holy days, but rather we should offend if we should for scrupulosity not save that God hath sent for the sustenance and relief of his people. And yet in such times of necessity (if their business be not very great and urgent) men ought to have such regard to the holy day that they do bestow some convenient time in hearing divine service as aforesaid.

'Against this commandment generally do offend all they which will not cease from their own carnal wills and pleasures.

'Also they, which, having no lawful impediment, do not give themselves upon the holy day to hear mass, to hear the word of God, to remember the benefits of God, to give thanks for the same, to pray to exercise such holy works as be appointed for such days, but (as commonly is used) pass the time either in idleness, in gluttony, in riot, or other vain or idle pastime, do break this commandment. For surely such keeping of holy day is not according to the intent and meaning of this commandment, but after the usage and custom of the Jews, and doth not please God, but doth much more offend him, and provoke his indignation and wrath towards us. For, as S. Austin saith of the Jews, they should be better occupied labouring in their fields, and to be at plough, than to be idle at home. And women should better bestow their time in spinning of wool, than upon the sabbath day to lose their time in leaping and dancing, and other idle wantonness.

'All they do also offend against this commandment, which do hear the word of God, and give not good heed thereunto that they may understand it, or if they do understand it, yet they endeavour not theirselves to remember it, or if they remember it, yet they study not to follow it.

'And all they break this commandment which in mass time do occupy their minds with other matters, and like unkind people remember not the passion and death of Christ, nor give thanks unto him ; which things in the mass time they ought specially to do. For the mass, wherein after the consecration is really present the very blessed body and blood of Christ, is celebrate in the church for a perpetual memory of his death and passion.

'And likewise do all those, which in such time as the common prayers be made, or the word of God is taught, not only themselves do give none attendance thereunto, but also by reading, walking, talking, and other evil demeanour, let other that would well use themselves.

'And likewise do all they which do not observe, but despise such laudable ceremonies of the church, as set forth God's honour, and appertain to good order to be used in the church.'

APPENDIX B.

BISHOP WILBERFORCE (OF OXFORD) ON SUNDAY AMUSEMENTS.

'*Lavington, Petworth, September 4th*, 1846.

'My Dear Walker,—I cannot give you any authority to contradict what you have heard, because it is true that the Prince very often does play at chess upon Sunday evening. But before anyone is scandalised by it, I think he would do well to inform himself a little more on the whole matter. The Prince, you must remember, has had a continental education; he has been accustomed to regard Sunday as it was regarded, I believe, all over Christendom, until the English Puritans altered the English feeling—not as the Sabbath, but as the great Christian Feast of the Lord's Resurrection, much as we keep Christmas Day. The day is kept by the very strictest and most spiritual German Lutherans and Reformed as a day for public worship and general relaxation. Every pastor in Germany, the most strict Pietists included, goes after the afternoon service and presides over the playing of a national game, analogous to our cricket, and, as the scoring of this game requires much skill, the pastor always scores. This you may see in every village in Germany. Now the Prince is a thoroughly sincere Lutheran, and, not feeling our mode of keeping Sunday to be essentially religious, he does not feel bound to conform to it, whilst he does feel that as its mode of keeping with us is now associated with all our religious feeling, he would on no account violate the religious feeling of others. Consequently *cards* are always

banished on Sundays, but very often he plays at a round German game of four at chess, with three gentlemen present. I never play, because I explained, that whilst I could not say that I thought the *act* was wrong, yet I thought it would be highly inexpedient in me to have it said that a clergyman played. I have never been asked again, but always sit at another table in conversation with the Queen. Of course for a person who believed that it was a breach of the law of God to play at chess on Sunday, it would be wrong not to *protest against* it; but I do not think so. I think Christian liberty leaves such matters very much at large. Of course, I think it far better that persons should find even their relaxation in what savours of heavenly things; but I do not think the *act* wrong, or the Sunday to be kept as a Sabbath. I believe we as a nation gain much on the one side and lose much on the other by our utterly untrue notions as to Sunday. I believe many are led to spend the day better—here is the good—than they would if they saw games, etc., encouraged after afternoon church. But I believe that the untruth of teaching people to believe that a Sabbatical abstinence is our duty does far more harm, leading many to violate their consciences, giving rules which cannot be kept, making it impossible to distinguish between a sinful disregard of the Lord's Day, and that use of it as a day of rest and gaiety which it is meant to be, specially for the poor and the confined, and so that multitudes who under a sounder teaching would come to church and give hours to devotion, etc., and then take their children into the country for a Sunday evening, are led to regard themselves because they do this as Sabbath breakers, and so to throw away all observation of a day, the due observation of which they have been accustomed to regard as what they find to be impossible. These were my dear father's views about Sunday, its spiritual character,—the entering into that spiritual character being signally blessed to any one and a mark of growing spirituality, etc.—but the non-*Sabbatical* character of it.

'I believe that to proclaim these views would do harm, because the mass of the religious people of the land are so pervaded with other views, that it would be really to encourage the irreligious to promulgate them; but, when obliged to act upon one's

convictions, one must; and I can only say that I feel perfectly convinced there is no sin in such an act, and that, whilst a devoutly spent Sunday evening is a *far higher blessing and joy*, it would not be one whit more pleasing to God if H.R.H. were to sit in an idle, judging, Puritan spirit condemning others, whose judge he is not, rather than playing at chess, but, on the contrary, much more displeasing to Him.'—*Life of Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford*, vol. i. p. 277.

APPENDIX C.

'AN HOMILY OF THE PLACE AND TIME OF PRAYER.'

'. . . And albeit this commandment of God doth not bind Christian people so straitly to observe and keep the utter ceremonies of the sabbath-day, as it was given unto the Jews, as touching the forbearing of work and labour in time of great necessity, and as touching the precise keeping of the seventh day, after the manner of the Jews; for we keep now the first day, which is our Sunday and make that our sabbath, that is, our day of rest, in the honour of our Saviour Christ; who as upon that day rose from death, conquering the same most triumphantly; yet, notwithstanding, whatsoever is found in the commandment appertaining to the law of nature, as a thing most godly, most just, and needful for the setting forth of God's glory, it ought to be retained and kept of all good Christian people. And therefore, by this commandment, we ought to have a time, as one day in the week, wherein we ought to rest, yea, from our lawful and needful works. For like as it appeareth by this commandment, that no man in six days ought to be slothful or idle, but diligently to labour in that state wherein God hath set him; even so, God hath given express charge to all men, that upon the sabbath-day, which is now our Sunday, they should cease from all weekly and work-day labour, to the intent that like as God himself wrought six days, and rested the seventh, and blessed and sanctified it, and consecrated it to quietness and rest from labour; even so God's obedient people should use the Sunday holily, and rest from their common and daily business, and also give themselves wholly to heavenly exercises of God's true religion and service.'

APPENDIX D.

Canon xxx. of 1603.

'. . . Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things which they held and practised, that, as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies, which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points, wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the apostolical churches, which were their first founders.'

APPENDIX E.

ON THE TEMPORARY DISUSE IN THE EARLY CHURCH OF CERTAIN TERMS CONNECTED WITH THE JEWISH RELIGION.

Canon Carter, *Doctrine of the Priesthood*, pp. 121-124 (2nd edition).

'Christianity arose, not as the antagonist of the Mosaic system, but as its inner life, gradually developed under the covering of its external forms. The infant community of Christians in some degree even recognised the Jewish Priesthood. They observed the Levitical Sabbath. S. Paul, at the instance of the rest of the Apostles, "purified himself and was at charges with four men which had a vow upon them"[1] And of all the brethren it is said, "They continued daily with one accord in the temple."[2] Evidently the Church in the beginning was led to cling as long as possible to the Holy City, its Temple and its mysteries, as though the same spirit breathed in her, Which had hung weeping over Jerusalem, still yearning, if it were possible, "to gather her children together, as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings." Not until they were violently forced away, did the Apostles and brethren quit their hold of the sacred precincts. It was manifestly not the design of God to precipitate the

[1] Acts xxi. 24. [2] Acts ii. 26.

separation, to throw scorn on the ancient faith, to present Christianity to the world as a rival institution, or to bring out too prominently at first all the distinctions which were in due season to unfold themselves out of the old institutions, as their hidden meanings under new forms. To have assumed at once the long-established name of the minister of the Jewish Temple would have been inconsistent with this economy, and must have placed the Gospel immediately in direct and personal antagonism with the Jewish religion; and while the Christian converts frequented the Temple services, and received certain ordinances at the hands of the Jewish priests, must have caused serious heart-burnings and confusion in the minds of both communities. No such objection on the other hand attached to the term, elder, which was employed by the Jews indifferently for all offices of reverence and authority.

'There was besides a further object to be attained. The mind of the Jew was to be weaned from the external associations of his ancient faith. How he clung to the mere "letter" of the Law is evident from the whole history of the New Testament. To disengage the subject from the shadow, in which it had been enveloped, and which the popular conscience had mistaken for the substance itself, was of vital importance. But a very little knowledge of human nature shows how the superstitious and formal, rather than the essential and spiritual, features of a system cling to long-established words, and how difficult it is to remove the ideas habitually attached to them, so long as they continue in use. This could hardly fail to have been the case with a term, around which had grown up all the ideas connected with the Levitical covenant. The disuse of the term may therefore be regarded as a merciful provision to facilitate the progress of the Jewish mind to a clearer view of the spiritual realities of the new kingdom.

'That such principles operated in the establishment of Christianity may be concluded from the fact, that a similar destiny awaited the term "Sabbath." Like the term Priest, it is employed nowhere in the New Testament in reference to Christianity. The case is even stronger with regard to the term Sabbath than that of Priest. For the observance of holy days, and specifically of the Sabbath Day, is spoken of with

positive reprobation as destructive of the simplicity of faith in Christ. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ."[1] And again: "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years: I am afraid of you."[2] Again, it may seem a superficial view, from the fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that all sabbatical observances, or days of rest, had passed away with the coming in of a deeper spiritual life, and that the only rest contemplated by the Gospel is the soul's inward repose on Christ. Yet coincidentally with this rejection of the term Sabbath, and of holy days and seasons, the Apostles and brethren were observing the Lord's Day, and Passiontide, Easter, and Wednesdays and Fridays, as days of observance associated with the Betrayal and Crucifixion of our Lord, may be traced up through the dimness of the earliest tradition to the age of the Apostles. In the writings of the Apostolic Fathers the term Sabbath never occurs except in connection with the Jewish apostacy, which was stigmatised by the opprobrious name of "sabbatizing." Later still S. Augustine speaks of the Sabbath as observed only spiritually and having its fulfilment in Christ. The subsequent history of the two terms similarly coincides. Both rose to life again after a time, and became fixed in the ordinary language of the Church, only the term Priest at a much earlier date than the other. The term Sabbath has not been applied to the day of Christian observance until quite modern times.

'This remarkable similarity in the usage of these two terms forms a very strong presumption that the same principle has operated in both cases. While there was danger to be apprehended from Jewish ideas becoming attached to the new system, from mere confusion, or from the appearance of antagonism, the Jewish terms were suspended, though the *ideas* of Priesthood and Sabbath passed into the Christian system. When this danger no longer existed and the separation of the two systems was complete the terms themselves were again freely used. The Priesthood and the Sabbath were the two most striking and characteristic features of the Mosaic system, penetrating the

[1] Col. i. 16. [2] Gal. iv. 10.

whole national life; and if in any case such a safeguard as has been suggested might be expected to operate, it would have been pre-eminently in these two cases.'

APPENDIX F.

AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF SUNDAY.

The Rambler. No. 30.[1] Saturday, June 30th, 1750.

'Mr. Rambler,—There are few tasks more ungrateful than for persons of modesty to speak their own praises. In some cases, however, this must be done for the general good, and a generous spirit will, on such occasions, assert its merit, and vindicate itself with becoming warmth.

'My circumstances, sir, are very hard and peculiar. Could the world be brought to treat me as I deserve, it would be a publick benefit. This makes me apply to you, that my case being fairly stated in a paper so generally esteemed, I may suffer no longer from ignorant and childish prejudices.

'My elder brother was a Jew; a very respectable person, but somewhat austere in his manner: highly and deservedly valued by his near relations and intimates, but utterly unfit for mixing in a large society, or gaining a general acquaintance among mankind. In a venerable old age he retired from the world, and I in the bloom of youth came into it, succeeding him in all his dignities, and formed, as I might reasonably flatter myself, to be the object of universal love and esteem. Joy and gladness were born with me; cheerfulness, good-humour, and benevolence, always attended and endeared my fancy. That time is long past. So long, that idle imaginations are apt to fancy me wrinkled, old, and disagreeable; but, unless my looking-glass deceives me, I have not yet lost one charm, one beauty of my earliest years. However, thus far is too certain, I am to every body just what they choose to think me, so that to very few I appear in my right shape; and though naturally I am the friend of human kind, to few, very few comparatively, am I useful or agreeable.

[1] For No. 30, Dr. Johnson was indebted to Miss Katharine Talbot, daughter of the Rev. Edward Talbot, Archdeacon of Berks, and Preacher at the Rolls chapel.

'This is the more grievous, as it is utterly impossible for me to avoid being in all sorts of places and companies; and I am therefore liable to meet with perpetual affronts and injuries. Though I have as natural an antipathy to cards and dice, as some people have to a cat, many and many an assembly am I forced to endure; and though rest and composure are my peculiar joy, am worn out and harassed to death with journeys by men and women of quality, who never take one but when I can be of the party. Some, on a contrary extreme, will never receive me but in bed, where they spend at least half of the time I have to stay with them; and others are so monstrously ill-bred as to take physic on purpose when they have reason to expect me. Those who keep upon terms of more politeness with me, are generally so cold and constrained in their behaviour, that I cannot but perceive myself an unwelcome guest; and even among persons deserving of esteem, and who certainly have a value for me, it is too evident that generally whenever I come I throw a dulness over the whole company, that I am entertained with a formal, stiff civility, and that they are glad when I am fairly gone.

'How bitter must this kind of reception be to one formed to inspire delight, admiration and love. To one capable of answering and rewarding the greatest warmth and delicacy of sentiments!

'I was bred up among a set of excellent people, who affectionately loved me, and treated me with the utmost honour and respect. It would be tedious to relate the variety of my adventures, and strange vicissitudes of my fortune in many different countries. Here in England there was a time when I lived according to my heart's desire. Whenever I appeared, publick assemblies appointed for my reception were crowded with persons of quality and fashion, early drest as for a court, to pay me their devoirs. Cheerful hospitality everywhere crowned my board, and I was looked upon in every country parish as a kind of social bond between the squire, the parson, and the tenants. The laborious poor everywhere blessed my appearance; they do so still and keep their best clothes to do me honour; though as much as I delight in the honest country folks, they do now and then throw a pot of ale at my head, and sometimes an unlucky boy will drive his cricket ball full in my face.

'Even in these my best days there were persons who thought me too grave and demure. I must, forsooth, by all means be instructed by foreign masters, and taught to dance and play. This method of education was so contrary to my genius, formed for much nobler entertainments, that it did not succeed at all.

'I fell next into the hands of a very different set. They were so excessively scandalised at the gaiety of my appearance, as not only to despoil me of the foreign fopperies, the paint and the patches that I had been tricked out with by my last misjudging tutors, but they robbed me of every innocent ornament I had from my infancy been used to gather in the fields and gardens; nay, they blacked my face and covered me all over with a habit of mourning, and that too very coarse and awkward. I was now obliged to spend my whole life in hearing sermons; nor permitted so much as to smile upon any occasion.

'In this melancholy disguise I became a perfect bugbear to all children and young folks. Wherever I came there was a general hush, and immediate stop to all pleasantness of look or discourse; and not being permitted to talk with them in my own language, at that time, they took such a disgust to me in those tedious hours of yawning, that having transmitted it to their children, I cannot now be heard, though it is long since I have recovered my natural form, and pleasing tone of voice. Would they but receive my visits kindly, and listen to what I could tell them—let me say it without vanity—how charming a companion I should be! To every one could I talk on the subjects most interesting and most pleasing. With the great and ambitious, I would discourse of honours and advancements, of distinctions to which the whole world should be witness, of unenvied dignities and durable preferments. To the rich I would tell of inexhaustible treasures, and the sure method to attain them. I would teach them to put out their money on the best interest, and instruct the lovers of pleasure how to secure and improve it to the highest degree. The beauty should learn of me how to preserve an everlasting bloom. To the afflicted I would administer comfort, and relaxation to the busy.

'As I dare promise myself you will attest the truth of all I have advanced, there is no doubt but many will be desirous of improving their acquaintance with me; and that I may not be

thought too difficult, I will tell you in short how I wish to be received.

'You must know I equally hate lazy idleness and hurry. I would everywhere be welcomed at a tolerably early hour with decent good-humour and gratitude. I must be attended in the great halls, peculiarly appointed to me, with respect. But I do not insist upon finery; propriety of appearance, and perfect neatness, is all I require. I must at dinner be treated with a temperate, but cheerful social meal; both the neighbours and the poor should be the better for me. Some time I must have a *tête-à-tête* with my kind entertainers, and the rest of my visit should be spent in pleasant walks and airings among sets of agreeable people, in such discourse as I shall naturally dictate, or in reading some few selected out of those numberless books that are dedicated to me, and go by my name. A name that, alas, as the world stands at present, makes them oftener thrown aside than taken up. As those conversations and books should be both well chosen, to give some advice on that head may possibly furnish you with a future paper, and anything you shall offer on my behalf will be of great service to, Good Mr. Rambler, Your faithful friend and servant, SUNDAY.'

APPENDIX G.

MR. GLADSTONE'S VIEWS ON SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.

The Rev. S. E. Gladstone writes:—

'My father seldom spoke about Sunday; and when I suggested to him to write an article, he said he had nothing more to say: that S. Augustine said everything. . . .

'His practice was very regular. He taught us to put away all common things, and have a Sunday book to read; and you know how his Church worship took up the bulk of every Sunday morning (even when he was at his very busiest in London), and a good slice of Sunday evening.

'I never heard him complain of the length, but often of the shortness (or rather curtailment) of the services. He liked the whole service in the morning, such as he had been used to, *i.e.*,

with the Litany. He could not bear services, or forms of family prayer, without *intercessions*. But there are collateral things that go to show that he regarded worship as the chief occupation for Sundays, and to this end he would sacrifice (without feeling it was sacrifice) a great many of the best hours of the day and would walk miles (*e.g.* in Scotland) to get a service.

'Once when at Balmoral, he met me by arrangement some miles away, and we had a service together in the open. He had a strong feeling in favour of "twice" on Sunday, and spoke of the "oncers," not, however, of course, in any scornful sense. Sermons he regarded almost as of the essence of the day, which was so remarkable in him. Very rarely, if ever, did he adversely criticise sermons.

'Sunday seems to be fast disappearing through the action of the rich and leisurely. At their door will lie a fearful responsibility for the irreligion which will take place. But this is my remark.'

The following is taken from the *Hawarden Parish Magazine* of October 1899.

'Sir,—I shall be glad to call attention to the fact that Mr. Gladstone attributed to a great extent his vigorous old age to his habit of observing the Sunday as a day of quiet, rest, and worship. In March 1869, he told a deputation that "the religious observance of Sunday is a main prop to the religious character of the country. From a moral, social, and physical point of view, the observance of Sunday is a duty of absolute consequence." In 1876, in a letter to myself he wrote, "Believing in the authority of the Lord's Day as a religious institution, I must, as a matter of course, desire the recognition of it by others. But over and above this I have myself, in the course of a laborious life, signally experienced both its mental and its physical benefits. I can hardly overstate its value in this view, and for the interest of the working men of this country, alike in these, and in yet other higher respects, there is nothing I more anxiously desire than that they should more and more highly appreciate the Christian day of rest. In 1889

in a letter to the French statesman, the late M. Léon Say, he wrote, "It seems to me unquestionable that the observance of Sunday rest has taken deep root both in the convictions and habits of the majority of my countrymen. If it appears to many of them a necessity of spiritual and Christian life, others not less numerous defend it with equal energy as a social necessity. The working class is extremely jealous of it, and is opposed not merely to its avowed abolition, but to whatever might indirectly tend to that result. Personally, I have always endeavoured, as far as circumstances have allowed, to exercise this privilege; and now, nearly at the end of a laborious career of nearly fifty-seven years, I attribute in great part to that cause the prolongation of my life and the preservation of the faculties I may still possess." And so late as last June in writing to myself, he said, "I adhere with growing strength to the opinions I have many times expressed on the subject of the Lord's Day rest."

I am, etc.,

CHARLES HILL,
'Secretary of the Working Men's Lord's Day 'Rest Association.'

APPENDIX H.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE IN AMERICA.

The following letter is written by one who has lived many years in the United States:—

'Your questions were:—

'"(1) How far secular amusements are in vogue on Sundays—museums, concerts, etc.?

'"(2) Whether on the whole church attendance has diminished so far as you know?

'"(3) Whether there is not a general impatience of all old-fashioned restraints and a tendency to throw off all that is 'traditional'?"

'The answers to these questions, given to me by a man of very wide experience, who was an Admiral in the U.S. (Volunteer) Navy and subsequently became a Methodist preacher, are as follows:—

'"(1) Most of the theatres and concert gardens are open in

the evening, under the guise of giving 'sacred concerts.' They come within the pale of the law only in the matter of not having the actors and singers appear in costume.

'"(2) Attendance at church (all denominations) has decidedly diminished in proportion to the population.

'"(3) Yes, decidedly so. Doctrinal teachings have given way to practical and topical higher criticism and scholastic culture (so-called). These are the reasons why that which is traditional is surrendered."

'I think I can give somewhat fuller answers :—

'(1) It depends on the latitude and environment. In New Orleans, Louisiana, I can remember the time when they raced on Sunday. It was the Latin influence, the French Creole stock. Now the theatres are open there as on week-days, as also in San Francisco and most of the towns in the Far West. When the Grau Grand Opera Company was in San Francisco last winter, when I was there, there was great trouble in getting the stars to go on on Sunday night, but they had to do it. All the theatres are in full blast, as well as the music halls and "dives." And this, as I understand, is nearly invariably the case west of the Mississippi. In the East, these so-called "sacred concerts" obtain. No stage dress is permitted ; else an ordinary music hall performance is given. The regular theatres are *not* open on Sundays. On the museum question a long fight has been kept up for years, and on the whole the people who favour the closing of these places on Sundays have won, but the chances are that they will all be thrown open on Sundays within a year or two. Mind you, each State has its own laws on these points.

'(2) On the whole I should say that church attendance has diminished, once more in proportion to the population. But this is so huge a country that I have had very small chance to observe, and so far as I know the attendance has been better maintained in the country districts, of which I have seen next to nothing in the last dozen years.

'(3) Yes, most emphatically. There is an impatience of all traditional restraining influences. This is shown in a variety of ways.

'Beyond a doubt, the large element of the Latin and German races in all communities here has had a great effect in "secu-

larising" Sunday. Here in Brooklyn, a town that was largely settled originally by English, Scotch, and Irish, there is so infinitely more inclination to observe Sunday than in San Francisco or New Orleans, that there is absolutely no comparison. Coney Island, New York's breathing spot, which is Margate a thousand times worse and more "wide open," is in full blast, but the cars to it pass through a city where "tradition" is mostly observed. There is a lot of "individuality" to the cities here, largely coming from the nationality that originally predominated in their settlement. The Germans do not see why they should not drink all the beer they want to on Sundays; the Frenchmen want to dance, and so on. This is a polyglot, cosmopolitan, heterogeneous land, and what is true of one place is false of another. There is more difference between New York and San Francisco than between New York and London.

'Finally, the whole modern tendency is distinctly revolutionary, socialistic, and anti-plutocratic, hence anti-religious. The strikes we hear of every day in the United States are the expression of this feeling. The up-boiling is yet to come, but it will arrive, more's the pity.'

The following is an extract from the New York *Sun* of February 9th, 1902:—

'Until last winter there was one period of the week free from the professional entertainer. This was Sunday afternoon. At that happy time there were no song recitals, nor were there piano pounders abroad in the land. Choral societies were mute save for the occasional performances in private of the various German singing societies. That was a restful, happy time, and the sound of shawms and cymbals was not heard in the island of Manhattan.

'But the number of performers on musical instruments increased even if the days of the week did not. They simply had to be heard, these performers who insisted on breaking into public favour. Jealous *impresarios*, looking around, discovered the unoccupied calm of Sunday afternoon. There, so they began to argue last winter, is a time unoccupied by the concert

agent. We will enter and break the Sabbath quiet that has long prevailed.

'So David Bispham jumped over the fence into Sunday afternoon, and after that the Sunday afternoon concert became a phenomenon of the week. Already had the evening hours been appropriated for the opera house concerts and whatever others might be given in halls or theatres. The afternoon now became equally occupied. One recent Sunday in this city brought out four concerts in public halls, to which the public could have access if it paid. In addition there were many entertainments of musical character. Four were known to the reporter. One of these was a subscription musicale to which admission was paid, two were teas with music at which the minor artists of the Metropolitan sang, and the third was a really musical performance at which a distinguished quartet played.

'Sunday afternoon, dedicated to the informal reception at home, has now become the day for afternoon music. Some of the organisations which have selected the day show how popular it has become. The Kneisel Quarter now gives a regular series of Sunday afternoon concerts with Arthur Whiting; every Sunday afternoon is occupied by some kind of recital at Carnegie Hall. Gerrit Smith has just announced a series of Sunday afternoon lectures, musically illustrated; Signor Guardabassi has given one of four musical teas: half a dozen persons not so well known have also announced Sunday afternoon concerts and musical teas, and the churches are coming into rivalry with this new Sunday diversion. They announce cantatas or anthems of an especially elaborate character to keep the interest of the public from going altogether out to the concerts and musical entertainments given in private houses.

'Now the most elaborate of all the Sunday afternoon musical performances is soon to begin. Herman Hans Wetzer is to give a series of symphony concerts at Carnegie Hall, with an orchestra of sixty-five men. None of these entertainments is, as a rule, of a kind to attract the immense audiences which go to the Metropolitan concerts; but the fact that Sunday afternoon has remained popular as a time for concerts shows that the *impresario* who first thought of that day was not wrong.

'It is a peculiarity of Sunday music that it is as a rule cheaper

than the kind heard on week-days. For none of the Carnegie Hall concerts given on that day, for instance, are the prices ever demanded that are asked on week-days. This condition does not, however, exist in the case of the Sunday afternoon subscription musicales. They are no cheaper because they are given on Sunday afternoons.

'In addition to the musicales there is a growing disposition among persons who give musical entertainments to put them on Sunday afternoons. The cause of this is, of course, the same that led women to select Sunday as a day at home. The men are able to come then. So cards sent out for informal musicales are likely, in the majority of cases nowadays, to bear the information that Sunday is the day, and the former quiet has been interrupted to make another suitable day for the army of musicians which has found the old days set aside for concerts and recitals too few.

'It is not only in this respect that the change in the observance of Sunday in this city has been noticed. Entertaining in other than musical forms has become more usual. The Sunday evening dinner has taken its place as the most liked of the social diversions of the winter. That the absolute disappearance of the Sunday night tea has at last been accomplished is shown just as well by the sights to be met in the restaurants as by the increasing number of private entertainments.

'It is on Sunday that the public desire to dine out seems greater than on any other day. At Sherry's, Martin's, and some of the places especially popular with those who dine out on Sundays there are more crowds on this day than on any other. Various reasons have led to this result. One is that the cook is likely to be absent at least on every other Sunday, and it is desired to escape a home meal prepared by the kitchenmaid or one of the domestic substitutes for the head of the kitchen. But equally important is the desire to get out of the house to dinner on Sundays; and that seems to be more and more widespread in the community every year. Certain it is that the Sunday night tea, which a decade or more ago used to be common, has quite passed out of fashion. Its place has been taken, in the case of all who are able to do what they want, by the dinner in the restaurant or with guests at home.

'The appearance of the boxes at the opera house when the stars sing on Sunday nights seems to show that there is no longer the least prejudice against places of amusement on Sunday nights. The appearance of the restaurants with the music and the gay parties is further evidence of the change that has come over the views of the city as to the observance of Sunday during the last few years. The eagerness with which the Sunday entertainments have been appreciated seems to show that society was as anxious for another day of amusement in the week as were the musicians who began to give their concerts on Sunday.'

APPENDIX I.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE IN SCOTLAND.

From the *Christian Leader*.

'The Glasgow Sunday of 1850 presented a strong contrast to that of the present day. The streets were then hushed into solemnity; no omnibuses, no trains, hardly a cab or carriage, unless going to a baptism in church, no shops open save those of the chemists after church hours, no possibility of dissipating with lemonade or "Turkish delight," for the ice-cream and sweetie shops were rigidly closed. It was indeed a Puritanical Sunday that prevailed, for the streets were almost deserted during church time, and the loafer loafed at home, not at the street corner. Work of every kind was at a standstill. Even the flames of the unquenched furnaces at Govanhill, "Dixon's Blazes," as they were called, seemed to have something sacrilegious about them, suggesting that labour was required to keep them alight on the sacred "Sabbath Day." On summer evenings straggling parties might make their way to Kelvingrove Park, or Queen's Park, and the "Brigton weavers" might wander through Glasgow Green to hear debates by such heroes as Harry Alfred Long, Mitchell the Universalist, or Warrington the preacher. But Sunday generally was a day of peace and solemnity, when the frivolous novel was forbidden,

and even the children dared only look at pictures of Scriptural subjects.

'We have altered all that; and the first to lay the torch to the pile was Norman Macleod of the Barony. In 1860 he began the publication of *Good Words*, in which, with much strictly Sunday reading, there was always a serial novel. The douce Glasgow citizens began to discover that they could read such mild fiction as Alexander Smith, Miss Muloch, and Mrs. Oliphant provided without much deterioration of moral fibre. Then came the famous battle in the Presbytery over "the perpetual obligation of the Fourth Commandment," and the broad-minded Catholic attitude which Norman Macleod took up, had a great influence in modifying the character of the Glasgow Sunday. It is possible that the liberty which he fought for is now showing a tendency to degenerate into licence; but for that he cannot be altogether blamed.'

APPENDIX J.

EUCHARISTIC WORSHIP.

'It is that act around which all those other acts of prayer, thanksgiving, praise, adoration and communion revolve. Nay, it is the *only* act in which *true worship* is attained, and by which you can at all express the real relations which exist between man and his Maker.

'Prayer indeed is good; you all must pray if you be Christians at all; but here you have reached no point of *worship*; you show God no honour different in *kind*, however much it may differ in degree, from that which you pay to your fellow men—for to them you pray as often as you ask the help you believe they have power to bestow. Besides, as you only pray when you have something to pray *for*, either for yourselves or others, prayer must ever be an act having more reference to self and to humanity than to God. Your ordinary *offerings* again, though they exceed the value of prayer, in virtue of their unselfishness, still fall short of the "honour due unto the Lord." Money you offer also to your fellow-men. The fruits of the earth you also present in token of fealty or of honour to others of your

race. Nay, even in that very "living sacrifice which you make of your souls and bodies to the Lord as your reasonable service," you have not yet reached the point at which you can say you are yielding that to God which God *alone* can claim, and which to Him *alone* is due. For there have been those who, in return for some signal act of benevolence—deliverance from threatened death, or rescue from the depths of misery—have yielded their whole powers of body and mind in grateful service to the benefactor who has saved them. No; man himself at the very best can never be a worthy sacrifice to his Creator; he can never be a "victim without spot or blemish." There is but one Offering which man can offer to God; there is but one Sacrifice in which a worthy act of worship is paid by man to God. It is that "pure Offering which shall in every place be offered unto God's name."[1] It is that Sacrifice once made on Calvary, for ever presented in heaven, and continually represented by the Church on earth in obedience to the command, "Do this." You can never know what "worship" is until you have offered the Sacrifice of the new covenant. You can never know what God is in His relations to man until you have offered the Son of God Himself as your act of homage and propitiation to the Father.' From the *Kiss of Peace*, by G. F. Cobb.

APPENDIX K.

The following extract from *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer* (Procter and Frere), p. 498, shows how the great service of the Lord's Day ceased to take its proper place:—

'The direction for the "ante-communion service" is an attempt to revive the old custom, current in primitive times, of saying the introductory part of the Liturgy on solemn days when there was no celebration of the whole. In the book of 1549 this, together with the Litany, was prescribed for Wednesdays and Fridays, the "Station Days" of the early Church. The rubrics then assumed that there would be a Communion on Sundays and Holy Days; but in case of failure, they provided that on all other days, beside the Litany days, *whensoever the*

[1] Mal. i. 11.

people be customably assembled to pray in the church and none disposed to communicate with the priest, the first part of the service should be said. By 1552 the Communion on Holy Days could no longer be counted upon, and the order was extended to *the Holy Days if there be no Communion*. This order continued until the last revision in 1661, when it had long been evident that even a regular Sunday Communion was a thing of the past, and consequently the opening portion of the office was directed to be said *upon the Sundays and other Holy Days if there be no Communion*. By this process all primitive character departed from the rubric, and instead of attempting to retain a primitive custom, where the daily Eucharist with communicants was not possible, it has ended by acquiescing in the disuse of the Lord's service on the Lord's Day. The cause that has led to this result has been the provision in the following rubric forbidding to proceed to the solemn part of the Liturgy without communicants. This very necessary reform, when promulgated among people who were in the habit of communicating only once a year, had the immediate result that for want of communicants a constant celebration of the Lord's Supper never came into use, and the daily Mass was discontinued. For the priest could not communicate alone, and the people had not learned to communicate except at Easter. The disuse of the Liturgy then proceeded by rapid strides, although the Reformers showed in every possible way that they wished to introduce more frequent Communion, and their provision for the ante-communion service was at least a way of reminding the people of their duty.'

APPENDIX L.

The following passage, from Pater's *Marius the Epicurean*, vol. ii. pp. 130-136, 138, 139, 141 (1885), expresses the strange, supernatural power of the great Eucharistic action:—

'To understand the influence over Marius of what follows, you must remember that it was an experience which came in the midst of a deep sense of vacuity in things. The fairest products of the earth seemed to be dropping to pieces, as if in

men's very hands, around him ; and still, how real was their sorrow and his ! "Observation of life" had come to be like the constant telling of a sorrowful rosary, day after day ; till, as if taking infection from the cloudy sorrow of the mind, the senses also, the eye itself, had grown faint and sick. And now it happened as with the actual morning on which he found himself a spectator of this new thing . . . There were noticeable, amongst those assembled, great varieties of rank, of age, of personal type. The Roman *ingenuus*, with the white toga and gold ring, stood side by side with his slave ; and the air of the whole company was, above all, a grave one—an air of recollection. Coming thus unexpectedly upon this large assembly, so entirely united, in a silence so profound, for some purpose unknown to him, Marius felt for a moment as if he had stumbled by chance upon some great conspiracy. Yet that could scarcely be, for the people here collected might have figured as the earliest handsel, or pattern, of a new world, from the very face of which discontent had passed away. Corresponding to the variety of human type there present, was the various expression of every human type of sorrow assuaged. What desire, and fulfilment of desire, had wrought so pathetically in the faces of these ranks of aged men and women of humble condition ? Those young men, bent down so discreetly on the details of their sacred service, had faced life and were glad, by some science, or light of knowledge they had, to which there was certainly no parallel in the older world. Was some credible message from beyond "the flaming rampart of the world"—a message of hope, regarding the place of men's souls and their interest in the sum of things—already moulding their very bodies, and looks and voices, now and here? At least, there was a kindling flame at work in them which seemed to make everything else Marius had ever known look comparatively vulgar and mean. There were the children, above all —troops of children—who reminded him of those pathetic children's graves, like cradles or garden-beds, he had noticed in his first visit to these places ; and they more than satisfied the odd curiosity he had then felt about them, wondering in what quaintly expressive forms they might come forth into the daylight if awakened from their sleep. Children of the Cata-

combs, some but "a span long," with features not so much beautiful as heroic (that world of new, refining sentiment having set its seal even on childhood, like everything else in Rome, naturally heroic), they retained, certainly, no spot or trace of anything subterranean this morning in the alacrity of their worship—as ready as if they had been at their play—stretching forth their hands, crying, chanting in a resonant voice, and with boldly upturned faces, Christe Eleison !

'For the silence—silence, amid those lights of early morning, to which Marius had always been constitutionally impressible, as having in them a certain reproachful austerity—was broken suddenly by resounding cries of "Kyrie Eleison ! Christe Eleison !" repeated again and again alternately, until the bishop, rising from his throne, made sign that this prayer should cease. But the voices burst out again soon afterwards in a richer and more varied melody, though still antiphonal; the men, the women and children, the deacons and the congregation, answering each other, as in a Greek chorus. But, again, with what a novelty of poetic accent; what a genuine expansion of heart; what profound intimations for the intellect, as the meaning of the words grew upon him ! The "hymn" of which Pliny had heard something, had grown into this. *Cum grandi affectu et compunctione dicatur*, says an ancient Eucharistic order; and certainly, the mystic tone of this praying and singing was one with the expression of deliverance, of grateful assurance and sincerity, upon the faces of those assembled. As if some profound correction, and regeneration of the body by the spirit, had been begun, and already gone a great way, the countenances of men, women, and children, had a brightness upon them which he could fancy reflected upon himself— an amenity, a mystic amiability and unction, which found its way most readily of all to the hearts of the children themselves. The religious poetry of those Hebrew Psalms . . . was in marvellous accord with the lyrical instinct of his own character. Those august hymns, he thought, would remain ever hereafter one of the well-tested powers among things, to soothe and fortify his soul. One could never grow tired of them !

'In the old pagan worship there had been little to call out the intelligence. The eloquence of worship, which Marius found

here—an eloquence, wherein there were very many ingredients, of which that singing was only one—presented, as he gradually came to see, a fact, or series of facts, for intellectual reception. This became evident, more especially in those lections, or sacred readings, which, like the singing, in broken vernacular Latin, occurred at certain intervals, amid the silence of the assembly. There were readings, again with bursts of chanted invocation between for fuller light on a difficult path, in which many a vagrant voice of human philosophy, haunting men's minds from of old, came sounding in clearer tones than had ever belonged to them before, as if lifted above their natural purpose into the harmonies of some more masterly system of knowledge. And last of all came a narrative, in a form which every one appeared to know by heart with a thousand tender memories, and which displayed, in all the vividness of a picture for the eye, the mournful figure of Him, towards whom the intention of this whole act of worship was directed—a figure which seemed to have absorbed, like a tincture of deep dyes, into His vesture all that was deep-felt and impassioned in the experiences of the past.

'It was the anniversary of His birth as a little child they were celebrating to-day. Astiterunt reges terrae—proceeded the Sequence, the young men on the steps of the altar responding in deep, clear, antiphon or chorus—

> '"Astiterunt reges terrae—
> Adversus sanctum puerum tuum, Jesum;
> Nunc, Domine, da servis tuis loqui verbum tuum—
> Et signa fieri, per nomen sancti pueri Jesu!"

And the proper action of the rite itself, like a half-opened book to be read by the duly initiated mind, took up those suggestions, and carried them on into the present, as having reference to a power still efficacious, and in action among the people there assembled, in some mystic sense. The whole office, indeed, with its interchange of lections, hymns, and silences, was itself like a piece of highly composite and dramatic music; a song of degrees, rising to a climax. Notwithstanding the absence of any definite or central visible image, the entire ceremonial process, like the place in which it was enacted,

seemed weighty with symbolical significance, and expressed a single leading motive. . . . It was a sacrifice also, in its essence —a sacrifice it might seem, like the most primitive, natural, and enduringly significant of old pagan sacrifices, of the simplest fruits of the earth. And in connection with this circumstance again, as in the actual stones of the building, so in the rite itself, it was not so much a new matter, as a new spirit which Marius observed, moulding, informing, with a new intention, many observances which he did not witness now for the first time. Men and women came to the altar successively, in perfect order; and deposited there, below the marble lattice, their baskets filled with wheat and grapes, their incense, and oil for the lamps of the sanctuary, bread and wine especially— pure wheaten bread and the pure white wine of the Tusculan vineyards. It was a veritable consecration, hopeful and animating, of the earth's gifts, of all that we can touch and see—of old dead and dark matter itself somehow redeemed at last, in the midst of a jaded world that had lost a true sense of it, and in strong contrast to the wise emperor's renunciant and impassive attitude towards it. Certain portions of that bread and wine were selected by the bishop; and thereafter it was with an increasing mysticity and effusion that the rite proceeded. Like an invocation, or supplication, full of powerful in-breathing or empneusis, the antiphonal singing developed, from this point, into a kind of solemn dialogue between the chief ministrant and the whole assisting company—

SURSUM CORDA!
HABEMUS AD DOMINUM.
GRATIAS AGAMUS DOMINO DEO NOSTRO!

'It was the service specially of young men, standing there, in long ranks, arrayed in severe and simple vesture of pure white, a service in which they would seem to be flying for refuge (with their youth itself, as a treasure in their hands to be preserved) to one like themselves, whom they were ready to worship; to worship above all in the way of Aurelius, by imitation and conformity to his image. "Adoramus te, Christe, quia per crucem tuam redemisti mundum!" they cried together. So deep was the emotion, that, at moments, it seemed

to Marius as if some at least there present perceived the very object of all this pathetic crying Himself drawing near. Throughout the rite there had been a growing sense and assurance of one coming. Yes, actually with them now; according to the oft-repeated prayer or affirmation, Dominus vobiscum! Some at least were quite sure of it; and the confidence of this remnant fired the hearts and gave meaning to the bold, ecstatic worship of all the rest about them. . . .

'One by one the faithful approached, and received from the chief ministrant portions of the great white wheaten cake he had taken into his hands—"Perducat vos ad vitam aeternam," he prays half-silently, as they depart again after discreet embraces. The Eucharist of these early days was, even more completely than at any later or happier time, an act of thanksgiving; and while what remained was borne away for the reception of the sick, the sustained gladness of the rite reached its highest point in the singing of a hymn; a hymn which was as the spontaneous product of two opposed companies or powers, yet contending accordantly together, accumulating and heightening their witness, and provoking each other's worship, in a kind of sacred rivalry.

'"Ite, missa est!" cried the young deacons; and Marius departed from that strange scene with the rest. What was this? Was this what made the way of Cornelius so pleasant through the world? As for himself; the natural soul of worship in him had at last been satisfied as never before. He felt, as he left that place, that he must often hereafter experience a longing memory, a kind of thirst, for all that over again. Moreover, it seemed to define what he must require of the powers, whatsoever they might be, that had brought him into the world at all, to make him not unhappy in it.'

APPENDIX M.

OBSERVANCE OF AN EVE OF SUNDAY.

The Rev. J. R. Milne, in a valuable pamphlet entitled 'Primitive Christianity and Sunday Observance,' makes a

strong appeal in favour of the observance of Sunday eve, or as we generally call it Saturday evening, as the true method of beginning the solemnities of Sunday. The grounds of his argument are the primitive and historical sanction for such observance, and its natural reasonableness.

The little book will well repay study; only a very slight reference can be made to it here.

His main points are as follows: (1) The Scriptural manner of reckoning time is from evening to evening ('the evening and the morning were the first day'); darkness followed by light constitutes a day, not an artificial division of midnight to midnight. (2) The Jewish Sabbath was of course observed in this way, and so naturally the Christian Sunday would thus be observed too in the first days. This was almost certainly the way in which it was being kept at Troas;[1] and the Eucharist would come at the close of a long vigil of prayer and fasting, at break of dawn. (3) This primitive observance of Sunday eve, it is maintained, was the origin of the whole vigil system generally; and 'in the recently discovered document entitled "Peregrinatio S. Silviæ," written about the end of the fourth century, we have an interesting account, by a lady pilgrim to the holy places, of the services then held in the Church of Jerusalem, and she specially mentions the multitudes of lay-people who frequented the vigils on Sundays and great festivals, some remaining throughout to the morning, others going home for an interval of rest before returning to the morning service with its long preachings and the celebration of the Eucharist' (p. 25). (4) The original use would have been Vespers followed by Nocturns and Lauds, and then the Mass. Later, this true order became disorganised by the addition of the other offices. (5) The modern practice, whether of Rome or England, is unprimitive. The Roman theory and practice is that Mass alone constitutes the proper public service of Sundays and great festivals, and that attendance at Mass, apart altogether from habitual Communion, is the sufficient observance of Sunday. That which came to be considered the Anglican theory, and which certainly was the Anglican practice, regarded attendance at Morning or Evening Prayer,

[1] Acts xx. 7.

with occasional Communion, as the sufficient fulfilment of our duty in the matter of Sunday observance. It is not difficult to see the inadequacy of either of these interpretations of our duty in this respect. The true idea, as represented in earlier ages, is expressed (*e.g.*) in one of the Canons of a Council held at Rouen in the middle of the seventh century, which directs that all the faithful should on Sundays and festivals attend Vespers, Nocturns and Mass. (6) The change arose through the regrettable disregard in which the offices came to be held, until they were taken to be a matter which concerned the clergy and monks alone. (7) After the historical survey, much of interest and value is adduced to show the practical importance of the observance of Sunday eve, its use as a preparation, by prayer and instruction, for the coming Eucharist, and how Sunday is far more truly observed by keeping Sunday eve (*i.e.* Saturday evening) than Sunday evening.

The little book, which should be read by any one interested in the question of Sunday observance, is published by A. H. Goose, Rampant Horse Street, Norwich; or Kegan Paul, Trübner and Co., Charing Cross Road, London.

APPENDIX N.

THE SUNDAY REST.

From the *Spectator*, February 15th, 1902, in a review of *The Apostles of the South-East*, by Frank T. Bullen.

'Mr. Bullen has much to say out of personal experience upon the Sunday labour question, and his testimony is strong upon the desirability of keeping out the "Continental Sunday." With his customary frankness and simplicity, he goes back to the days when the question touched him personally, as a hard-working man in very humble circumstances:—

'"Employed from nine to five in a quasi-government office at a meagre salary, I tried to eke out, in the hours that should have been devoted to recreation and reading, that salary by working at the trade of a picture-framer, a trade I had taught myself. When business was brisk this often necessitated my

being in my workshop at 2 A.M. in order to fulfil the contract I had made to deliver frames at a certain time. It also meant my working up till sometimes as late as 11 P.M. So that when Sunday came, with its placid, restful morning, I always felt profoundly grateful, not only for the bodily rest, but for the way in which I was able to throw off the mental worries of the week."

'Mr. Bullen kept his day of rest holy as well as free from work-a-day cares, and he found time also to help his wife in preparing the dinner, and in doing other household jobs. But apart from those who spend Sunday religiously, he is satisfied that the vast majority of the men of the working class who go neither to church nor chapel are as much averse as he is to "such an abolition of one day's rest in seven as may be seen on the Continent." About one practice that militates against the Sunday rest he is very eloquent and practical, and that is the late shopping on Saturday night. For this habit he acknowledges that a certain measure—about five per cent.—of the responsibility rests with the men who stay in the public-house until they are necessarily turned out on the stroke of twelve on the Saturday night, and then only hand over the remainder of their wages to their wives. But the bulk of the evil lies at the door of the women, who put off their shopping to the last moments of the last day of the week, partly out of sheer idleness, and partly out of a mean avarice which suggests the hope of getting a good bargain out of an exhausted shopkeeper in the small hours. Well may Mr. Bullen describe this system as a cruel "persecution of the poor by the poor."'

APPENDIX O.

A NEW YORK CHURCH.

From the *Church Commonwealth.*

[The following account of a remarkable piece of organisation is printed here, not from any desire of emulation, but in order to show to what parochial activity may attain.]

'S. Bartholomew's Church, New York, affords the best

illustration of a church ministering in a thousand ways to the numberless needs of the heterogeneous population of a great American city.

'There are eighteen different services on Sunday in the church and parish house, which makes the Sabbath quite a day of rest, as the average number of gatherings of all kinds for the remainder of the week is thirty-two daily.

'The schedule of services, meetings of all sorts, classes, and the like, for each day in the week, show a total of 212 for the seven days. Six of these, however, are for a portion of the year only, and ten are irregular, occurring only once or twice a month.

'Among the Sunday services in the parish house are one in German, one in Armenian, and one in Chinese; there are also regular services in the Swedish Chapel. Rescue mission work, with its nightly meetings, has been a prominent feature of the parish house. The aggregate attendance upon these meetings has been as large as 120,000 in a year, and 5000 have professed to seek the new life.

'There are 2146 communicants in the entire parish. Among the 152 confirmed the past year were eight Chinese, seventeen Armenians, and forty-five adult Germans. Surpliced choirs of each of the above nationalties render the music in their own language in the missions.

'In the parish house Sabbath school, which shows a total enrolment of 1408, there are classes taught in Armenian, Syriac, and Turkish, as well as in English.

'This institution is proving to be an alembic in which many foreigners are being transmuted into Americans. The Armenian helper writes:—"I am proud to say that as a good citizen I taught twenty-one Armenians, my old countrymen, the United States Constitution."

'Clubs are a large part of the work. Membership in the Girls' Evening Club entitles the holder to "the use of the club rooms and library; access to the large hall every evening after nine o'clock, to the physical culture classes, lectures, talks, entertainments, discussion class, glee club, literature class, the Helping Hand Society, Penny Provident and Mutual Benefit Funds; the privilege of joining one class a week in either dress-

making, millinery, embroidery, drawn work, system sewing, or cooking, and also, by paying a small fee, the privilege of entering a class in stenography, typewriting, French, or bookkeeping." Corresponding advantages attend membership in the other clubs. There are some 2200 persons in the Men's, Boys' and Girls' Clubs, the Armenian Club, and the Chinese Guild.

'In addition to these many facilities for self-development, there are five circles of King's Daughters, and various missionary societies to teach unselfish service.

'One unique feature of the parish house is its roof garden, on the top of nine busy storeys. In long boxes the children plant flowers and vegetables. These have a background of lilac bushes, syringa, dulcia, and other flowering shrubs in large tubs, while morning glories, honeysuckle, and ivy climb on the fence which surrounds the roof. The garden is used for the instruction and amusement of the children in the kindergarten when the weather permits, and is open of evenings to various societies.

'These children of the brick-and-mortar city are often seen to kiss and caress the flowers which they cultivate in the roof garden. The bringing of a bit of country to the parish house was suggested by the fact that a little girl, while crossing a bridge over a railroad track, dropped her only rubber doll on a moving train "so that it could see the country."

'A Holiday House at Washington, Conn., gave more than a bit of country to 343 girls last summer.

'The fresh air work of the parish gave 2046 outings, mostly to children and tired mothers.

'The tailor shop provides temporary work for many out of employment, and supplies garments for children in the Sabbath school and the industrial school. There were 3625 garments received, made over, and repaired, or made of new materials, the past year. There were 483.93 dollars received for sales, and 415 garments were given away. In addition to the above, the Benevolent Society provided 1624 garments, of which 680 were given away and 568 were sold.

'The report of the Penny Benevolent Fund shows 1,844.82 dollars received from 2648 depositors.

'One of the most beneficent of S. Bartholomew's many ministries is the Employment Bureau, which is conducted on business principles. During the past year, 1866 situations were filled in the domestic department, 186 in the mercantile department, 48 in the professional department, and 459 in the mechanical and labour departments. Half a hundred nationalities were represented by the applicants to this bureau.

'The Clinic had 7693 new patients last year. The total number of consultations was 24,146. The total number of prescriptions written was 13,607, of which 1293 were free.

'A loan association has saved many from falling into the hands of Shylock. Like the Employment Bureau, it is conducted strictly on business principles. It received 70,390.55 dollars during the year, and disbursed 63,375.12 dollars. It makes loans to the poor at much lower rates than they could get elsewhere, and it is so managed as to pay running expenses.

'The amount expended by the church on the parish house during the year was 52,002.78 dollars, and the total amount given for home expenditure and for benevolent contributions was 208,242 dollars. Including engineers, porters, etc., there are, all told, about fifty salaried workers at the parish house.

'The splendid work of S. Bartholomew's shows what can be done when occurs the rare combination of a big brain, a big heart and a big treasury.'

APPENDIX P.

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE 1887.

Observance of the Lord's Day.

(1) Extract from the Encyclical Letter of the Bishops:—

'The due observance of Sunday as a day of rest, of worship, and of religious teaching has a direct bearing on the moral wellbeing of the Christian community. We have observed of late a growing laxity which threatens to impair its sacred character. We strongly deprecate this tendency. We call upon the leisurely classes not selfishly to withdraw from others the opportunities of rest and of religion. We call upon master

and employer jealously to guard the privileges of the servant and the workman. In the Lord's Day we have a priceless heritage. Whoever misuses it incurs a terrible responsibility.'

(2) Report of the Committee appointed by the Lambeth Conference 1887 to consider the subject of the observance of Sunday:—

'Your Committee have met, and prayerfully considered the subject of the sanctity and observance of the Lord's Day, and have agreed to the following statements of their deliberate judgment on this momentous question, which they submit as their report:—

'1. That the principle of the religious observance of one day in seven is of Divine and primeval obligation, and was afterwards embodied in the Fourth Commandment.

'2. That from the time of our Lord's Resurrection the first day of the week was observed as a day of sacred joy by Christians, and was ere long adopted by the Church as the Christian Sabbath or the 'Lord's Day.'

'3. That the observance of the Lord's Day as a day of rest, of worship, and of religious teaching, has been a priceless blessing in all Christian lands in which it has been maintained.

'4. That the growing licence in its observance threatens a grave change in its sacred and beneficent character.

'5. That especially the increasing practice on the part of some of the wealthy and leisurely classes of making the day a day of secular amusement is most strongly to be deprecated.

'6. That the most careful regard should be had to the danger of any encroachment upon the rest which on this day is the right of servants as well as their masters, and of the working classes as well as their employers.

'Signed, on behalf of the Committee,—E. H. Exon, Chairman.'

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Abbot, Archbishop, 62.
Abelard, 49.
Affection, blended with authority, 257.
Agde, the Canon of, 28.
Agnew, Sir Andrew, his Bill, 96-98.
Agricultural work, permitted on Sundays, 29, 51.
Albert, Prince Consort, 98.
Almsgiving, a Sunday duty, 242, 243.
Ambrose, S., 26.
America, parochial organisation in, 295-298; Sunday observance in, 279-284.
Amusements on Sunday, 73, 91, 92-97, 268-270, 281-284; their insufficiency, 118, 157.
Ante-Communion Service, the, 286, 287.
Antioch, Canon of, 27.
Apostolic origin of Sunday, the, 13-15, 33, 35, 41, 55, 252.
Apostolic Constitutions, 27, 28.
Apostolorum Didascalia, 23.
Appeal, our, to whom made, 119.
Aquinas, S. Thomas, 51.
Arnold, Matthew, 208, 211, 212.
Assumption, Feast of the, in Paris, 238.
Athanasius, S., 25, 44.
Augustine, S., 26, 48, 55, 146, 264, 267, 273, 277.

Baring Gould, Rev. S., 57.
Barnabas, S., Epistle of, 21.
Barrington, Bishop, 82.
Basil, S., 26.
Baths, Saturday, in Russia, 187-189.
Beauty, appreciation of, 233, 234.
Benson, Rev. R. M., 170.
Bernard, S., 51.
Bethesda, the Pool of, 132.
Bible reading, 225, 226.
Bicycling, 232.
Biography, the value of, 227, 228.
Birkbeck, W. J., 183.
Bishops' Book, the, 55.
Bishops, Encyclical Letter of the, 298.
Body of Christ, the responsibility of the whole, 246.
Body, the claims of the, 198-202; not evil, 200; the sanctity of, 198; to be subjected, 199-201.
Book of Sports, the, 61.
Booth, Charles, 217.
Borrow, George, 221, 222.
Bownd, Dr., 60, 61.
Bramhall, Archbishop, 57.
Bright, Dr. W., 174.
Browne, Simon, 262.
Browning, Robert, 142, 151, 206, 215, 261.
Bullen, Frank T., 294, 295.

Canon xiii. of 1603, 225.
Canon xxx. of 1603, 271.
Cardwell, 225.
Carter, Canon T. T., 65, 76, 271-274.
Catechism, the Church, 55, 56, 160, 173.
Cathedrals, 180, 181.
Causes of Sunday neglect, 113.
Cawdrey, Richard, 30.
Cecil, Richard, 82.
Ceremonial, without teaching, 159; value of, 172.
Chadwick, Dr., 71.
Character, the importance of, 141, 228.

Charles I. and II., 61, 62.
Chichele, Archbishop, 52.
Children and Sunday observance, 75, 83-90, 171, 172, 262.
Choir offices, their importance, 170; the, in relation to the Eucharist, 169, 171, 293, 294; of the Eastern Church, 194 ff.
Christian Observer, The, 85, 86, 91.
Christian Year, influence of, 99.
Chrysostom, S., 46.
Church, the, her mission to individual souls, 137; a priestly body, 177.
Church-going, modern decline in, 101 ff.
Church workers need quiet, 207, 208.
Church, Dean, 209-211.
Clapham Evangelicals, the, 86, 87.
Classes, distinction of social, 223, 224.
Clergy, their duty of teaching, 156.
Clergy and laity, 246.
Cloveshoe, Canon of, 28.
Clubrooms, 245.
Clubs, the London, 237.
Collegiate bodies, 180.
Commandment, Fourth. *See* Fourth Commandment.
Communion on Sunday, 27, 28, 286, 287. *See* Eucharist.
Conciliar enactments, 27 ff.
Confirmation, preparation for, 244.
Congregational system, perils of, 247, 248.
Congress, Church (Brighton), 100.
Conscience, 3, 4, 258.
Constantine, Edict of, 29-33, 51.
Continental Sunday, the, 238, 263.
Country and town, 154.
Cricket, 231, 232.
Cross, the, must be taught, 116, 117; the sacrifice of the, 164, 165.
Cruickshank, George, 92.
Culture and religion, 232-235.
Cyprian, S., 23.

Dale, Dr., 45, 140.
Dickens, Charles, 88, 90.
Didache, evidence of the, 20, 42.
Didascalia Apostolorum, 23.
Discipline, 255.
—— of life, the need of, 3, 262.
Döllinger, Dr., 41, 165.
Dominical views of Sunday, 12, 13.
Driver, Dr., 40, 45, 82, 128, 129, 134, 143.

Early ages of the Church, Sunday in the, 7-49.
Easter Day, 14, 15, 17, 22, 26.
Ecclesiastical ordinance of Sunday, [12.
Eldersheim, Dr., 47.
Edgar the Peaceable, 51.
Edward VI., injunctions of, 225.
Egbert, Constitutions of, 51.
Elizabeth, Sunday in the reign of, 59; injunctions of, 225.
Elliberis, Canon of, 27.
England, severe restrictions in the Middle Ages in, 51.
English Church, formularies of, 55; not committed to Sabbatarianism, 57.
English Councils, Canons of, 28, 51, 52.
English Reformation, the, 54 ff.
English tradition, the, 263.
Englishman, the average, 155.
Ephrem Syrus, S., 44, 45.
Eucharist, sacrificial aspect of the, 162, 165-175; children present at the, 171, 172; intention with which offered, 173, 285, 286; at Troas, 16; in sub-Apostolic times, 20-22; a necessary part of Sunday worship, 24, 25, 27, 28, 54, 55, 102, 169-173, 183, 184; power of the, 287-292; a corporate act, 166, 167, 175 ff.; in Georgian era, 168, 169.
Eucharistic Presence, the, 166.
Eusebius, 29, 30.

Faith, unsettlement of, 204, 205.
Family ties, loosening of, 115.
Fasting, 255; analogy of, 65; necessary, 261; before Communion, 191, 192; on Sunday forbidden, 26.
Fathers, the, contrasted with the Reformers, 53, 54; teaching of the, 22, 25, 26, 44, 46, 48, 52.
Ferrar, Nicholas, 75, 76.
Festivals, multiplication of, 32, 50; rejected by the sects, 52; Sunday a festival, 262.
First fruits, 140.
Formality, danger of, 114, 116.

Forty Days, the Great, 14, 252.
Fourth Commandment, the, 10-12, 34, 35, 38, 44, 55-57, 71, 108, 134, 138, 140, 144, 145, 264-268.
Fuller, Church History, 60.

Games on Sunday, 231, 232, 268-270.
Geneva, 56, 57.
Gladstone, W. E., 35, 36, 48, 98, 277-279.
God, our relation to, 146-149; the Rest of, 134, 219, 220.
Golf, 231.
Gore, Bishop, 20, 65, 163, 259.
Gregory the Great, S., 52.

Hacket, Bishop, 27.
Hamilton, Sir E. W., 36.
Heaven, preparation for, 214, 215.
Herbert, George, 249.
Hessey, Dr., 16, 25, 31, 38, 39, 47, 53, 54.
Heylin, Peter, 61.
High Priest, the One Great, 166.
Holiness, need of, taught to Jews, 163, 164.
Holland, H. S., 49, 127, 158, 160.
Holy Spirit, the, His indwelling, 150, 151.
Home duties, 248-250.
Home life, value of its details, 249, 250; lacking in discipline, 257-259.
Homilies, the Book of, 57, 59, 270.
Hooker, Richard, 48, 56, 223, 242, 243.
Hort, Dr., 214.
Hospitality on Sunday, 236.
Howells, W. D., 4.

Ideal, need of a high, 116-121.
Idleness, 221.
Ignatius, S., 43.
Ignorance, 155.
Illingworth, Dr., 43, 138.
Image, man in God's, 149, 150, 199.
Incarnation, the, sanctifying the body, 200.
Indifference, 155.
Institution of a Christian man, the, 55.
Invalids, 245.
Irenæus, S., 22, 48.

James I., 61.
Jerome, S., 26.
Jesus Christ, His relation to the law, 127; His teaching about the Sabbath, 129-134; His authority, 133; demands ethical obedience, 133; the aim of His teaching, 135-138; His method of dealing with men, 137, 154-159; is the centre of His own teaching, 135-137.
Jewish law, object of its restrictions, 37, 128; its purpose, 68, 69; our Lord's relation to, 127.
Johnson, Dr. Samuel, 79, 274.
Joy, of Sunday, 21-26, 37, 139, 261, 263; of the Sabbath, 82.
Justice to self, 198.
Justin Martyr, S., 21, 22, 43, 48.

Kalendar, growth of the, 32, 33.
Keble, John, 99, 211, 215, 216, 231, 232, 234.
King's Book, the, 55, 264-268.
Kingdom of God, the, 138, 142.
Knox, Alexander, 224, 225.

Laing, Samuel, 56.
Laity, their share in the Church's work, 246-248.
Lambeth conference, the, 298, 299.
Lang, Bishop C. G., 250, 258.
Laodicea, council of, 46.
Laud, Archbishop, 62.
Leisure to be used, 221.
Licensing laws, 123.
Liddon, Dr., 136, 179, 226, 229, 236.
Life, fulness of, 148-153, 198; mysteries of, 153; the gift of, 197.
Lightfoot, Bishop, 48, 234.
Linklater, Dr., 175.
Little Gidding, Sunday at, 74-76.
Lollards, the, 52.
London, east end of, 103.
'Lord's Day, the,' 17, 18.

Macaulay, Zachary, 87.
Macon, council of, 51.
Man, his relationship to God, 146-153.
Martin, Sir Theodore, 98.
Mary, the Blessed Virgin, 209.
Mass, laity to attend the whole of, 28. *See* Eucharist.

Masterman, C. F. G., 217-219.
Materialism, 216-219, 253.
Middle Ages, Sunday in the, 50-54.
Milan, edict of, 29.
Milne, Rev. J. R., 51, 195, 292-294.
Milligan, Dr., 171.
Mind, the, needs rest, 202-206.
Miracles of healing, 130-133.
Moberly, Bishop, 69-71.
—— Dr. R. C., 166, 178.
Modern days, Sunday in, 72-125.
Money-making, 216.
More, Hannah, 82.
Morris, Rev. J. B., 44.
Mozley, Dr. J. B., 233.
Museums, 232, 236.
Mysteries of our religion, 167.

Neal, Daniel, 59, 62.
Necessary doctrine, A, 55.
Neglect of Sunday, causes of, 113, 253 ff.
'New Puritans,' 82.
New Testament references to Sunday, 14-19.
Newspapers on Sunday, 230.
Nicæa, 20th canon of, 27.

Obedience, 255-262.
Obligations, 178.
Offertory, the, 243.
Old age, 214.
Orleans, third council of, 46.
Overton, Canon, 72, 77, 80.
Oxford Movement, the, 168.

Paget, Sir James, 224, 227.
Paris, closing of shops in, on Sunday, 238-239.
Pascal, 213.
Passions, the, 201.
Pater, Walter, 287-292.
Patience needed, 259, 261.
Patmore, Coventry, 201.
Paul, S., 40, 70.
Peabody, Professor F. G., 137.
Pellicia, 28.
People, religion of the, 216-219.
Pessimism, 251.
Petrobussians, 52.
Pharisees, the, 129-133.
Picture galleries, 232-236.
'Pleasant Sunday afternoons,' 157.
Pliny, letter to Trajan, 20.
Poor, the, 153; Gospel must be preached to, 247, 248.
Pope, the, 239.
Porteus, Bishop, 81, 82.
Prayer Book, the English, 55, 56.
Presbyterians, 56.
'Priest,' use of the word, 64, 65, 272, 273.
Priesthood of the Church, the, 246, 247.
Primeval origin of the Sabbath, 11, 12, 38.
Principles, importance of, 3-5; of Sunday observance, 35, 36, 123-142.
Procter and Frere, 286, 287.
Prosecutions, 122.
Protestants in England, specially Sabbatarian, 56.
Psalter, the, 179.
Puritans, their tendency to introduce Jewish restrictions, 34; Sabbatarianism of the, 56, 60.
Pusey, Dr., 44, 46.

Quiet, need of, 141, 203, 253; found in God, 152; needs cultivation, 206, 207; in our Lord's earthly life, 208, 211.

Rabbis, the, 128.
Rambler, the, 80, 274-277.
Ramsay, Professor W. M., 42.
Reaction, danger of, 5, 256.
Reformation, the, 53-58; in England, effect of the, 54 ff.
Religious books, 226-228.
Rest on Sunday, first mention of, 23, 29; a means to an end, 45, 49; typical of the eternal rest, 13, 14, 37, 47-49; needful, 197-281, 270; the secondary object of Sunday, 270.
—— the main end of the Sabbath, 45, 46; its purpose, 141; the necessity for, 202, 294, 295; of God, the, 134, 219-220; the true meaning of, 220-223; no intrinsic merit in, 222; latitude allowed, 225; Mr. Gladstone's views on, 273, 279.
Restlessness, 253; in town life, 211; of the age, 207, 208.
Restraints, breaking down of, 2, 251-252.

Resurrection of our Lord, 15, 22-24, 26, 27, 35, 40, 43, 182, 183.
Retreat, value of a, 206.
Revolution, the French, 202.
Rich, the, 154.
'River, Sunday on the', 103, 116, 178.
Robertson, F. W., 69.
Robinson, Dr. J. Armitage, 195.
Rossetti, Dante Gabriel, 209.
Rules, their necessity, 135, 209-262.
Ruskin, John, Sunday in his childhood, 83-85.
Russell, G. W. E., 36.
Russia, Sunday in, 181-184.

Sabbath, Apostles preaching on, 42; cessation of, gradual, 38, 39; not changed into Sunday, 41; our Lord's relation to, 128; relative to man's need, 134; its philanthropic purpose, 143; type of the rest of heaven, 47; was it pre-Mosaic? 11, 12, 38; a day of joy, 82; rest its main purpose, 45, 46.
Sabbatarianism, extreme views stated, 10, 11; tendencies towards, 46, 47, 241, 252, 253; growth of, 50, 51; opposition to, 52; of the Puritans, 60; why impossible in early Church, 63; a right kind of, 62-71; analogies for right restoration of, 65, 66; how far necessary, 65.
Sabbatismos of heaven, the, 14, 37, 47.
Sacerdotalism, true and false, 177.
Sacraments and the body, 200, 201.
Sacrifice, the means of approach to God, 161-164; in the Old Testament, 162; root idea of, 162-164; imperfection of Jewish, 164; of the Cross, 164, 165; demanded of Christians, 177, 178.
Sardica, Canon of, 27.
Saturday evening, 236, 292-294; and Sunday, 43; a preparation for Sunday, 51; importance of, 195, 196; observed in Russia as the eve of Sunday, 185, 192.
Savoy Conference, the, 56.
Scandal, 239-242.
School missions, 247.
Scotland, decline of strict Sunday observance in, 106 ff., 284, 285; in the last generation, 109, 110.
Scruples, 240-242.
Self-denial, value of, 243, 245.
Self-sacrifice, 178, 179.
Separation, weakness of, 176.
Servants, 96, 236, 237.
Service for God, 229 ff.; for others, 142, 243-250.
Services in Russia, the length of, 189; hours of, 191.
Shairp, Principal, 232, 233.
Shops, Sunday opening of, 106 ff., 237-239.
Sibbes, Richard, 256.
Simcox, Rev. W. H., 64.
Social methods insufficient, 157.
—— need of Sunday, the, 229, 230, 244, 253, 254.
Solidarity of mankind, the, 230, 239.
Soulsby, Miss, 249.
Spectator, Addison's, 77, 79.
Spiritual insight, quiet needed for, 203, 204.
Sports, The Book of, 61.
Standing for prayer on Sunday, 23, 26, 27.
Statutes dealing with Sunday, 121-125.
Stevenson, R. L., 228.
Sub-Apostolic times, 19 ff.
Sunday, amusements, *see* Amusements; at country houses, 104 ff.; almsgiving on, 242, 243; Apostolic origin of, 13, 15, *see* Apostolic; a day for worship, rest, and service, 141-144; a 'home' day, 249, 250; a festival, 252; and the Resurrection, 182, 183; chief duty of, 24; gradual recognition of, 19; hospitality on, 236; later history of, 50, 71; modern changes in its observance, 1; modern decline of observance, 101 ff.; cause of neglect, 111, 112; need of enforcing observance of, 28; principles of observance of, 35, 36, 126-145, 253; Observance Act, the, 122-124; observance in America, 279-284; in seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, 72; in England since the Reformation, 58,

59; need of consideration, 8 ff.; League, the, 237; Russian names for, 182, 183; schools, 245; services in Russia, 189 ff.; statutes dealing with, 121-125; the teaching of Jesus Christ, 134-145; varying theories as to, 10 ff.
Sunday and Sabbath, 9, 10; evidence of the *Didache*, 20; tendency to confuse, 33; relation to one another, 33-49, 134, 135, 252; not held to be connected in first three centuries, 34.
'Sundays out,' 237, 245.
Supernatural life, the, 150, 151.
Swete, Dr. H. B., 133.
Swiss haymakers, 225.

Talbot, Miss Katharine, 274.
Teaching, importance of, 159.
Terms, fallen into disuse, 63-65, 271-274.
Tertullian, 22, 43, 48.
Theodolphus of Orleans, 52.
Time, consecration of a part of, 56, 63, 65, 66, 140, 141, 145, 243, 253, 254.
Toledo, council of, 28.
Town and country, 154.
Town life, 211, 216-219.
Trade on Sunday, 122-125.
Traffic on Sunday, 124-125.
Trajan, Pliny's letter to, 20.
Trench, Archbishop, 220.

Unselfishness, need of, 142-145, 231, 232, 236, 237, 239.
Ullathorne, Archbishop, 150, 151, 199.

Venn, Rev. John, 87.
Vespers of Saturday evening in the East, 185.
Victoria, Queen, 98.
Vocation, needs to be taught, 244, 247.

Waldenses, 52.
Westcott, Bishop, 48, 120, 134, 153, 242, 243, 263.
'Week-ends,' 237.
Whitgift, Archbishop, 61.
Wilberforce, William, 86.
—— Bishop Samuel, 268-270.
Work, the duty of, 220, 221; ordinary to be avoided on Sunday, 223.
Worship, main purpose of Sunday, 19-24, 26-28, 31, 37, 45, 47, 139, 141, 144-146; the expression of Christian life, 146; neglect of, 153-161; Eucharistic, 161-175, 285, 286; its meaning, 160, 161; man's special work, 160; self-chosen, 161; a source of power and gladness, 168; patience in restoring, 172; varying standards of, 180, 181; counteracts materialism and restlessness, 253; not to be shortened, 277, 278.

York, Synod at, 52.
Young, temptations of the, on Sunday, 235.

Zahn, 2, 18, 19, 23, 30, 31, 39, 40, 47, 51, 53, 63.

TEXTS QUOTED OR REFERRED TO

I. OLD TESTAMENT

	PAGE
Genesis i. 26,	199
31,	198
iii. 1-6,	255
xliii. 3,	248
Exodus xxiii. 15,	243
Leviticus xxi. 6,	164
2 Samuel xxiv. 24,	179
Psalm xlix. 12,	152
l. 5,	161
Isaiah, i. 11,	159
Ezekiel, xxxvii. 5,	127
xlvi. 1-3,	164
Micah vi. 3,	147
Malachi i. 11,	286

II. NEW TESTAMENT

	PAGE
S. Matthew v-vii.	127
v. 17,	47
xii. 1-8,	129
7,	134
9-12,	130
xiii.	138
xvi. 6,	158
xviii. 19,	176
xxiii.	37
S. Mark ii. 23-28,	129
27,	134
28,	133
iii. 1-4,	130
14,	159
ix. 42,	240
S. Luke vi. 1-5,	129
6-9,	130
xiii. 10-16,	131
16,	142
S. John i. 3,	234
ii. 4,	209
23, 24,	118, 158
S. John iv. 6,	118
23,	148
34,	255
42,	204
v. 5-18,	133
17,	134, 219
vi. 29,	204
60 ff.,	118
65,	118
vii. 6,	209
viii. 29,	255
ix. 14-16,	133
x. 10,	135
xii. 24,	265
24, 25,	137
xiii. 35,	142
xiv. 6,	140
xvii. 4,	255
19,	137
xviii. 34,	204
Acts i. 3,	14
ii. 26,	271
42,	19
44,	66
iv. 32,	66
xv. 20, 28, 29,	39
xx. 7,	16, 135
7, 12,	195, 293
35,	160
xxi. 24,	271
Romans i. 16,	117
iii. 25,	166
v. 19,	255
vi. 17,	259
vii. 12,	47
xiv. 5,	40
1 Corinthians i. 23,	117
ii. 2,	117
v. 5,	17
vi. 15, 19, 20,	147, 201

	PAGE
1 Corinthians viii.	62
13,	239
x. 23,	62, 239
24,	240
xii.	143
xvi. 1, 2,	16, 135, 243
Galatians, iii. 19,	38
28,	175
iv. 9-11,	40, 273
10,	273
Ephesians, i. 15-18,	203
iv. 1-3,	62
Philippians i. 6,	17
Colossians i. 9,	203
16,	273
17,	234
24,	177
ii. 16, 17,	40, 48, 63
Colossians iii. 1,	139
1 Thessalonians ii. 10,	221
Hebrews i. 3,	153
iii. 11.	48
iv.	37
9,	48
viii. 4,	64
x. 1-4,	176
1 S. Peter ii. 9,	130, 146
2 S. Peter i. 3,	151
iii. 10,	17
18,	203
1 S. John ii. 14,	214
iii. 3, 4,	151, 255
iv. 6,	118, 119
Revelation i. 10,	17
17,	214

Printed by T. and A. Constable, Printers to His Majesty
at the Edinburgh University Press

The Oxford Library of Practical Theology

Edited by the Rev. W. C. E. Newbolt, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's; and the Rev. Darwell Stone, M.A., Librarian of the Pusey House, Oxford.

Price 5s. each volume.

RELIGION. By the Rev. W. C. E. Newbolt, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

'*The Oxford Library of Practical Theology* makes a good beginning with Canon Newbolt's volume on religion. . . . The publishers have spared no pains in making the appearance of the volumes as attractive as possible. The binding, type, and general "get up" of the volume just issued leave nothing to be desired.'—*Guardian.*

HOLY BAPTISM. By the Rev. Darwell Stone, M.A., Librarian of the Pusey House, Oxford.

'Few books on Baptism contain more thoughtful and useful instruction on the rite, and we give Mr. Stone's effort our highest approval. It might well be made a text-book for candidates for the diaconate, or at least in theological colleges. As a book for thoughtful laymen it is also certain to find a place.'—*Church Times.*

CONFIRMATION. By the Right Rev. A. C. A. Hall, D.D., Bishop of Vermont.

'To the parochial clergy this volume may be warmly commended. They will find it to be a storehouse of material for their instruction, and quite the best treatise that we have on the subject it treats. It is thoroughly practical, and gives exactly the kind of teaching that is wanted.'—*Guardian.*

THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. By the Rev. Leighton Pullan, M.A., Fellow of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford.

'Mr. Pullan's book will no doubt have, as it deserves to have, a large number of readers, and they will gain a great deal from the perusal of it. It may be certainly recommended to the ordinary layman as by far the best book on the subject available.'—*Pilot.*

HOLY MATRIMONY. By the Rev. W. J. Knox Little, M.A., Canon of Worcester.

'Canon Knox Little has given us a most exhaustive treatise on Holy Matrimony written in his best and happiest style, and giving ample proofs of wide research and deep study of the various aspects, and the essential characteristics of Christian marriage. . . . We would strongly advise the clergy to place this work upon their shelves as a book of reference, while it forms a complete manual of instruction to aid them in the preparation of addresses on the subject.'—*Church Bells.*

THE INCARNATION. By the Rev. H. V. S. Eck, M.A., Rector of St. Matthew's, Bethnal Green.

'The teaching is sound, and the book may be placed with confidence in the hands of candidates for Orders or of intelligent and educated lay people who desire fuller instruction on the central doctrines of the Faith than can be provided in sermons.'—*Guardian.*

FOREIGN MISSIONS. By the Right Rev. E. T. Churton, D.D., formerly Bishop of Nassau.

'We welcome Bishop Churton's book as an authoritative exposition of the modern High Church view of Missions. It is good for us all to understand it, thereby we shall be saved alike from uninstructed admiration and indiscriminate denunciation.'—*Church Missionary Intelligencer.*

PRAYER. By the Rev. Arthur John Worlledge, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of Truro.

'We do not know of any book about prayer which is equally useful; and we anticipate that it will be a standard work for, at any rate, a considerable time.'—*Pilot.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

SUNDAY. By the Rev. W. B. Trevelyan, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Westminster.

'An extremely useful contribution to a difficult and important subject, and we are confident it will rank high in the series to which it belongs.'—*Guardian.*

THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION. By the Rev. Leighton Pullan, M.A., Fellow of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford.

*** *This book contains an account of the origin of Episcopacy, the three Creeds, the Ancient Western Liturgies and other institutions of the Church. Special attention is also given to the early history of Sacramental Confession and to the principle of Authority in the Church of England.*

BOOKS OF DEVOTION. By the Rev. Charles Bodington, Canon and Precentor of Lichfield.

'Extremely valuable for its high tone, fidelity to Catholic standards, and powerful advocacy of reality in private devotion. To those who have never studied the subject, it should reveal a mine of devotional wealth yet to be worked with profit to man and glory to God.'—*Church Times.*

HOLY ORDERS. By the Rev. A. R. Whitham, M.A., Principal of Culham College, Abingdon.

'For the educated layman who wishes to know what the Church is teaching about the ministry, and what the relation of the laity to it really is, this is the best book with which we have met.'—*Pilot.*

THE CHURCH CATECHISM THE CHRISTIAN'S MANUAL. By the Rev. W. C. E. Newbolt, M.A., Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

'We think the book should be in the possession of every teacher who can afford it, and in every Church Library for the benefit of those who cannot.'—*Reader and Layworker.*

THE HOLY COMMUNION. By the Rev. Darwell Stone, M.A., Librarian of the Pusey House, Oxford.

'The book meets a distinct want, and is indispensable to all who desire to have a concise and well-balanced summary of the different opinions which have been held with regard to the Holy Communion from the earliest days of the Church.'—*Oxford Diocesan Magazine.*

CHURCH WORK. By the Rev. Bernard Reynolds, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's.

'What is needed is a brightly written and sensible book which will suggest topics for consideration and the way in which a Christian should view them. The book before us fulfils these conditions. It is stimulating and suggestive, and that is exactly what is wanted.'—*Guardian.*

CHURCH AND STATE IN ENGLAND. By the Rev. W. H. Abraham, D.D., late Vicar of St. Augustine s, Hull.

'It is exactly the kind of work upon the subject which has long been needed—full, reliable, and sound.'—*Church Times.*

OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION. By the Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, M.A., of St. Mary's Hospital, Ilford.

THE PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS CEREMONIAL. By the Rev. Walter Howard Frere, M.A., of the Community of the Resurrection.

THE ATONEMENT. By the Rev. Leighton Pullan, M.A., Fellow of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford.

SIN. By the Rev. H. V. S. Eck, M.A., Rector of St. Matthew's, Bethnal Green.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

Handbooks for the Clergy

EDITED BY THE

REV. ARTHUR W. ROBINSON, B.D.

VICAR OF ALLHALLOWS BARKING BY THE TOWER

Crown 8vo, price 2s. 6d. net each volume.

THE PERSONAL LIFE OF THE CLERGY. By the EDITOR.

'It is a short book, but it covers a wide field. Every line of it tells, and it is excellent reading. Not the least valuable part of the book are the extremely apt and striking quotations from various writers of eminence, which are placed in the form of notes at the end of the chapters. It is emphatically a book for both clergy and laity to buy and study.'—*Church Times.*

'We are grateful for a little book which will be of service to many priests, young and old. We need more priests, and such a book may well increase their number by explaining the nature of the life to which a vocation to Holy Orders calls men: but we need still more that priests should realize the life to which they are called and pledged; and this they can hardly fail to do if they listen to Mr. Robinson's prudent and tender counsels.'—*Church Quarterly Review.*

PATRISTIC STUDY. By the Rev. H. B. SWETE, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

'The whole of the work which this little volume contains is most admirably done. Sufficient is told about the personal history of the Fathers to make the study of their writings profitable.'—*Church Quarterly Review.*

'This is an admirable little guide-book to wide study by one who well knows how to guide. It is sound and learned, and crammed full of information, yet pleasant in style and easy to understand.'—*Pall Mall Gazette.*

THE MINISTRY OF CONVERSION. By the Rev. A. J. MASON, D.D., Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge, and Canon of Canterbury.

'It will be found most valuable and interesting.'—*Guardian.*

'Canon Mason has given a manual that should be carefully studied by all, whether clergy or laity, or have in any way to share in the "Ministry of Conversion" by preaching, by parochial organisation, or by personal influence.'—*Scottish Guardian.*

FOREIGN MISSIONS. By the Right Rev. H. H. MONTGOMERY, D.D., formerly Bishop of Tasmania, Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

'Bishop Montgomery's admirable little book. . . . Into a limited compass he has compressed the very kind of information which gives one an adequate impression of the spirit which pervades a religion, of what is its strength and weakness, what its relation to Christianity, what the side upon which it must be approached.'—*Church Quarterly Review.*

THE STUDY OF THE GOSPELS. By the Very Rev. J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D., Dean of Westminster.

'Nothing could be more desirable than that the Anglican clergy should be equipped with knowledge of the kind to which this little volume will introduce them, and should regard the questions with which Biblical study abounds in the candid spirit, and with the breadth of view which they see here exemplified.'—*Spectator.*

A CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC. By the Very Rev. WILFORD L. ROBBINS, Dean of the General Theological Seminary, New York.

'We commend this handbook with confidence as a helpful guide to those clergy and teachers who have thoughtful doubters to deal with, and who wish to build safely if they build at all.'—*Church of Ireland Gazette.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

PASTORAL VISITATION. By the Rev. H. E. Savage, M.A., Vicar of Halifax, and Hon. Canon of Durham.

'This is an excellent book.'—*Spectator.*

AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH. By the Very Rev. T. B. Strong, D.D., Dean of Christ Church.

'This is a valuable and timely book, small in bulk, but weighty both in style and substance.'—*Guardian.*

THE STUDY OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. By the Right Rev. W. E. Collins, D.D., Bishop of Gibraltar.

'A book which displays the master-mind on every page, and has what many master-minds lack, a sober, practical, common-sense strain about it, which is hardly ever found in those who set out to instruct us in Church History, or Canon Law, or Catholic use.'—*Church Bells.*

LAY WORK AND THE OFFICE OF READER. By the Right Rev. Huyshe Yeatman-Biggs, D.D., Bishop of Worcester.

'A wise and valuable little book. Bishop Yeatman-Biggs knows what he is writing about; he has packed into a small space all that most people could desire to learn; and he has treated it with sense and soberness, though never with dulness.'—*Church of Ireland Gazette.*

RELIGION AND SCIENCE. By the Rev. P. N. Waggett, M.A., of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley.

'The main result of this remarkable book is to present the clergy, for whom it is intended primarily (but we hope by no means entirely, for it should appeal even more forcibly to the other camp, to the professors than to the preachers), with a point of view.'—*Church Times.*

CHURCH MUSIC. By A. Madeley Richardson, Mus. Doc., Organist of Southwark Cathedral.

'Probably scarcely a clergyman in the country would fail to benefit by Dr. Richardson's fifth and sixth chapters on the clergyman's part of the church services. Throughout the little book its earnestness and its thoughtfulness for the reader command respect.'—*Record.*

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS. By the Ven. Archdeacon Foxley Norris, M.A., Rector of Barnsley, and Hon. Canon of Wakefield.

'Every young clergyman should master the contents of this handbook.'—*Carlisle Diocesan Gazette.*

CHARITABLE RELIEF. By the Rev. Clement F. Rogers, M.A.

'This practical and suggestive manual should be earnestly commended to the parochial clergy. It is written clearly and concisely, and with a thorough grasp of the subject.'—*Guardian.*

INTEMPERANCE. By the Right Rev. H. H. Pereira, D.D., Bishop of Croydon.

'The methods for working reform suggested by Dr. Pereira are eminently practical. He points out what can be done by Acts of Parliament, but makes it plain that the heart of the evil can only be reached by personal effort on the part of the clergy.'—*Guardian.*

THE LEGAL POSITION OF THE CLERGY. By Philip Vernon Smith, M.A., LL.D., Chancellor of the Diocese of Manchester.

'It will be found a most useful book for reference on the many questions which are continually arising in connexion with the duties of the clergy and their legal position.'—*Church Family Newspaper.*

PREPARATION FOR CONFIRMATION. By the Rev. J. P. Maud, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

Donald Smith